

183

THE

# SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

## POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 863, Vol. 33.

May 11, 1872.

[Registered for  
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

## ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

THE confident rumours of last week had been dissipated before the appointed day for Lord RUSSELL's motion arrived; but the Ministers were entitled to claim still further forbearance from Parliament if they had reason to believe that there was still a chance of the withdrawal of the indirect claims. It might indeed be plausibly contended that the Government would only be strengthened in its avowed purpose by a Resolution of the House of Lords affirming the proposition to which Mr. GLADSTONE and Lord GRANVILLE are already pledged; but, on the other hand, the Resolution itself implied a want of confidence; and the Ministers would have been placed in the embarrassing position of opposing a motion in which they must be supposed substantially to concur. It was also possible that the American Cabinet, if it had been wavering, would have taken offence at a peremptory declaration of the irrevocable policy of England. The hesitation which has been already displayed shows that sounder counsels have sometimes almost prevailed over the policy which has been officially announced by Mr. FISH. The favourable reports which had revived general confidence were certainly not without foundation, although they were too confidently accepted as true. When Lord GRANVILLE urged Lord RUSSELL to postpone his motion, there had been no time to ascertain whether the PRESIDENT would be more or less disposed to concession in consequence of the Cincinnati nomination. It was evident that either pertinacity or a tendency to conciliation might affect General GRANT's popularity and the chances of his re-nomination; but only indigenous politicians are capable of balancing the advantages which might respectively result from the settlement or the reopening of the dispute. The contrivance which had been imagined to relieve the American Government from the necessity of simple retraction may perhaps have failed through its own intrinsic absurdity. It might have been worth the while of the English Ministry to concur in the frivolous declaration that consequential damages, as invented by Mr. SUMNER, should never be claimed by statesmen who must be assumed not to have forfeited all self-respect. It probably appeared on further consideration to the authors of the device that it would only entail ridicule on themselves; and they could not make up their minds to the more dignified course of simply correcting an error. It is not certain whether either House of Congress has had any influence on the latest decision of the PRESIDENT. The Chairmen of the respective Committees on Foreign Affairs in either House, Mr. CAMERON and Mr. BANKS, are not ordinarily disposed to promote friendly relations with England; yet it seems that Mr. BANKS called the PRESIDENT's attention to the motion which had been introduced into the House for the withdrawal of the claims, and that it was from Mr. FISH that the objection to any resolution of the kind seems to have proceeded. The members of the Committees who are friendly to the PRESIDENT were invited to discuss the question with the Cabinet, but they expressed their opinion that the whole body of their colleagues ought to have been consulted; and the Opposition members naturally resented their exclusion.

If it is true that the American Government and nation now regret the mistake of having preferred inadmissible claims, they may perhaps not think it necessary to abandon all parts of the Treaty when the project of arbitration has finally collapsed. It would be highly desirable that the San Juan controversy should be settled by the award of the German EMPEROR, and that the long-standing controversy on the Canadian fisheries should be removed from the sphere of contention. It is unfortunately too probable that the Americans will be irritated by their own miscarriage, and that they

will reject any arrangement which can even partially amount to an amicable settlement. A disputant who is demonstrably and consciously in the wrong is often inclined to support an untenable argument by a display of temper. There may even be American politicians who suppose themselves to have made a valuable concession in the almost official acknowledgment that no consequential damages could have been justly claimed or rightfully awarded. To Englishmen it seems that the impropriety of Mr. BANCROFT DAVIS's indictment is aggravated by the improbability that it could have served the purpose of his clients. Demands too extravagant to have been entertained can only have been inserted either in the hope of misleading the arbitrators or for the purpose of affronting the adverse litigant. The objection raised on the part of England has from the first been exclusively founded on the language and spirit of the Treaty and of the preliminary negotiations, and not on the discreditable character of the claims. It is unnecessary to discuss the idle pretext that the claims were included in the Case for the purpose of setting them finally at rest. The amicable settlement which was contemplated by the framers of the Treaty would, if it had been allowed by the American Government to come into operation, have disposed of all causes of difference down to the date of submission to the award. Even if outstanding liabilities had been reserved, there were no indirect claims in discussion when the Commissioners met at Washington. Mr. FISH, when he borrowed a monstrous doctrine from Mr. SUMNER, expressly declared, at the time of his note to Lord CLARENCE, that the PRESIDENT made no claim whatever. A rhetorical menace is not converted into even an inchoate or disputable right by the fact that it is uttered. After the Treaty, and an arbitration on the matters covered by the Treaty, a fresh demand on account of the pretended prolongation of the war could only have been intended either as an idle insult or as preliminary to a declaration of war. If the American Government has offered not to insist on the demand for consequential damages, it has virtually admitted the impropriety of submitting the claim to the arbitrators. It is impossible to doubt the readiness of the English Ministers to facilitate any arrangement which would be compatible with their own declarations and with the national determination; but in allowing the arbitration to proceed until the claims were withdrawn they would have conceded the whole matter in dispute. It was possible that the American counsel might have held that, in simply presenting the claims to the tribunal, they were fulfilling the pledge that they should not be pressed. The arbitrators might then have awarded a gross sum for damages, the whole or part of which might have been attributed by the Americans to the objectionable claims.

Although it is possible that the nomination of a Republican competitor may affect the policy of the PRESIDENT, the remarkable selection made by the Cincinnati Convention is in England only a subject of curious speculation. No candidate could be suggested who, as President, would be less likely to cultivate friendly relations with England. The dislike which Mr. GREELEY expressed a quarter of a century ago by his subscription in aid of the Irish rebels has not been mitigated by the steady adherence of the English nation to the Free-trade doctrines which he has never succeeded in understanding. A narrow fanatic in all political and commercial questions, Mr. GREELEY has habitually attributed to opponents the worst possible motives. When Mr. WELLS published the statistical documents which proved the mischievous working of the American tariff, Mr. GREELEY repeatedly asserted that Mr. WELLS had been bribed with English gold. If the PRESIDENT had withdrawn the claim for consequential

damages, Mr. GREELEY would in all probability have attributed the concession to similar motives. An English Mr. GREELEY would not be regarded as a serious politician, though he might perhaps be an estimable bigot; but in a country where political power is wielded by small farmers and mechanics, Mr. GREELEY has acquired extraordinary influence by his sympathetic reproduction of their own prejudices. The extent of his popularity is sufficiently proved by his success in the contest with Mr. ADAMS, who has, through circumstances, and perhaps by inclination, stood aloof from party, and who has proved himself to possess the acquirements and knowledge proper for a statesman. The managers of the Convention were perhaps the best judges of the comparative chances of the various candidates; but it is probable that Mr. GREELEY was elected by the votes of the Protestant members of the body. If he perseveres in the contest, a Democratic President will probably be in power after an interval of twelve years; and as the Senate and House of Representatives will continue to be Republican, the executive power will for the time be reduced to its lowest point. A President in difficulties is often tempted to bid for popularity by professions of hostility to England. On the whole, it is perhaps to be wished that General GRANT may succeed, notwithstanding the mismanagement by himself and his SECRETARY OF STATE of the litigation consequent on the Treaty. It is possible that he may wish to repair his blunder; while a successor might perhaps be still more exacting. Whether the English Ministers incur any risk through the failure of the Treaty is a question which must remain open until the history of the negotiation is known. As there is no reason to fear that they will concede the vital point in the dispute, few persons will be disposed to blame any efforts which they may have made to prevent, even by moderate sacrifices, the abandonment of the reference to arbitration. They would have better commanded the confidence of Parliament if, during the progress of negotiation, they had more plainly announced their final resolution.

#### THE BALLOT BILL.

THE reconsideration of the Ballot Bill on Thursday night gave rise to discussions on points of some importance. One leading subject of dispute was as to nominations, and a last fight was made for retaining the old system. The evils and absurdities of this system were pointed out by Mr. DISRAELI with his usual vivacity a quarter of a century ago; and the member who read the passage in one of Mr. DISRAELI's novels where nomination day is described managed to sum up the whole case against this most foolish of English customs in the tersest and most effective language, and to back his own opinion with the authority of the Conservative leader. In England, however, everything that is old has its sincere friends, simply because it is old, and Sir GEORGE GREY aptly represented the friends of that fine old piece of antiquity, the nomination day. Few customs have not had some sort of warrant in the times when they sprang up; and in old times when the nomination day was really the day of election, when the proceedings were serious, when the candidates really addressed the electors, and the show of hands really indicated the feelings of the constituency, everything that took place on that day may have seemed natural and proper to Englishmen. In modern times the custom has become very silly and very mischievous. There is not one vestige of reality about it. Those who are present are for the most part not electors; the candidates are not allowed to say a word that can enlighten or benefit any one; they are exposed to every kind of personal insult and annoyance; the show of hands does not indicate the opinions of the electors. No public end is served by it, while grave public evils attend it. The unruly mob which swears, reels, and throws dead cats on to the hustings, has to be kept in order, not only by the police, but often by hired prizefighters; and Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE amused his hearers by informing them that he used in former days to take care of his supporters and himself by stationing in the crowd a famous ex-champion of the Ring in the dress of a clergyman of the Church of England. A very large portion of the demoralization unhappily attending English elections can be distinctly traced to the custom of having a sham day of election prior to the real one; for the mob was thus encouraged to take the direction of affairs from the outset, and the constituency, being drowned in beer before it began to vote, never wholly recovered its senses. Of all the clauses of the Ballot Bill that which abolishes nomination days of the

old type is the only one which we can regard with unmixed satisfaction. It is quite true that, strictly speaking, this clause has nothing to do with the rest of the Bill. Even if nominations continued in all their familiar atrocity, the poll, when taken, might equally well be taken by secret voting. But as the clause is in the Bill, there is every reason to seize the opportunity of doing away with public nominations. Nor can it be said that the first clause of the Bill, by which nominations are henceforward to be made in the quietest and most orderly manner, is not connected with the clauses that follow, although the connexion is of an indirect kind. There are many advantages and many disadvantages in adopting the Ballot; but one of its least disputable advantages is that it will make the process of voting orderly and decorous. No one, if the Ballot Bill becomes law, will know how an elector has voted, and, what is still more important, no one will know how the poll is going. It is impossible that much excitement should accompany proceedings of which the course and the result are alike unknown until all is over. To buy this advantage which the Bill promises at the cost of the disadvantages which the Bill will also bring with it, and then to diminish almost to nothing the value of this advantage by keeping alive the enormous nuisance of riotous, rowdy crowds establishing a reign of terror and debauch on nomination day, would be absurd; and thus it may be fairly said that justice could not be done to a Ballot Bill unless the foolish custom of public nominations was at the same time brought to an end.

Mr. FORSTER undertook on bringing up the Report to announce the manner in which the Government would show itself willing to consult the wishes of those who desire that the hours of polling shall be lengthened. He accordingly proposed that in the four winter months the poll should close at five, that in the four summer months it should close at eight, and that in the four intermediate months it should close at seven. The feeling of the House was so dead against this proposal that the Government abandoned it on the spot, and declared itself willing that the hours of polling should remain exactly as they are under the present law. As, however, there were devotees of long polling hours who deplored this sudden change of front, and insisted that a vote should be taken, the Government was actually obliged to vote against its own amendment, and succeeded in getting it rejected by an overwhelming majority. There really was not an argument to be used in its favour, and it is by no means creditable to Mr. FORSTER that he should have made a proposal acceptable to no one, and indefensible in itself, merely because he had not originally devoted sufficient consideration to the subject to have a clear opinion by which he might guide the House. Mr. FORSTER could not but show how strongly he felt the force of the argument that, if his proposal was accepted, elections held in the winter time would never be considered fair to the working classes. If the poll was to be kept open till eight in summer because working men could not vote until their hours of work were over, an election held at a time of year when the poll would close at five would be most unsatisfactory; for the Parliament thus elected would be always open to the reproach that it did not represent the real feelings of the constituencies, and the Government of the day would be perpetually challenged to test the question by a real, proper, fair election held in summer time. Mr. FORSTER had only one way of escaping from this difficulty, and this was by declaring that elections in point of fact never or scarcely ever take place in the winter. As he happened to be addressing a House of Commons elected in a November, it was scarcely worth while to consider how far his assertion was historically true. When the time of an election is in the discretion of a Minister, as, for example, when Parliament is dissolved because the seven years for which it has been elected are nearly expired, the autumn months, which are most convenient to every one, are usually selected. But it may be of the utmost importance to the Crown and to the Government to have an election in the depth of winter. WILLIAM IV., for example, suddenly took it into his head in the late autumn to make Sir ROBERT PEEL Prime Minister, and Sir ROBERT's only chance of success lay in a dissolution. A general election was therefore held at Christmas time. The new Premier did not succeed in getting a majority; but if he had, and if Mr. FORSTER's proposal had then been in operation with an electoral body largely composed of working-men, his Government would have been hampered at every turn by the suspicion resting on the validity of its title to govern the country, in consequence of electors alleging that they could have turned the scale of the election against it had the contest taken place in summer. It was the clas-

tivity of constitutional government, one of the features most to be prized in it, that was really imperilled by this ill-considered proposal, and the House showed itself a much better guardian of the Constitution than the Government when it speedily consigned the proposal to a silent and ignominious grave.

There was, however, one change of considerable practical importance to which Mr. FORSTER induced the House to give its assent. Last week it was decided that electors unable to read might get the presiding officer to mark their papers for them, and it is clear that while this concession might possibly save a large number of voters from being practically disfranchised, it placed an enormous amount of power in the hands of the presiding officer. Mr. FORSTER strongly objected on this ground to the whole plan of getting illiterate people treated exceptionally, but he was obliged to yield. He has, however, now found a way of making the provision almost, if not wholly, nugatory. As the Bill now stands, if an elector is unable to read, he must go before a magistrate, who is to examine him and satisfy himself that he is really unable to read, and give him a certificate to that effect, and it will only be on the production of this certificate that the presiding officer will be enabled to offer him the help he needs. The number of poor men who will go through so laborious and distasteful a process as that of waiting on a magistrate, being examined by him, and then getting a public document stating that it has been satisfactorily proved that the bearer is totally uneducated, will be very small. Nor is it easy to see how a conscientious magistrate will be able to satisfy himself that a total stranger to him cannot read. It is easy enough to find out when a man can read, but it is impossible to find out when he cannot read. The duty of the magistrate will be to guard against a man who can read saying that he cannot read. But when a magistrate has put a book before a man who can read, and heard his statement that he cannot read a letter, it will be interesting to know what is the next step to be taken. Practically, the magistrate will have to certify that every one cannot read who says he cannot read. The use of the interposition of the magistrate is not really to guard against fraudulent statements, but to put the elector to so much inconvenience that either he will not vote at all or he will prefer to take his chance and vote as well as he can. Mr. FORSTER acknowledged this, and said that he firmly believed that every man could learn how to vote if he took the trouble, whether he knew how to read or not. In nine cases out of ten a man who cannot read, and who is not acted on either by intimidation or corruption, will not trouble himself to vote at all; and it certainly seems possible that the exceptional tenth man will prefer having a shot at making his mark when he wishes to make it rather than take a walk to a magistrate's, waste his time in waiting, and then get his certificate of incompetency. Mr. FORSTER will probably get his way, and men who cannot read will either not vote or will vote as they best can. But there is a considerable objection to any provision which, although inoperative, makes the Bill unpopular, and sets a barrier in the way of voting; and the knowledge that if they want to get helped to vote they must go through this painful process with the magistrate will seem a grievance in the eyes of men who cannot read and who do not really care about voting.

#### SPAIN AND THE CARLISTS.

IN one respect personal injustice has been done to the Spanish Pretender. It now appears that, after waiting some days in the neighbourhood of Bayonne, he crossed the frontier, and that soon afterwards he was present at an unsuccessful engagement with a portion of SERRANO's army. According to the Government papers, a glorious and decisive victory was obtained by the regular troops; and it seems to be admitted that they took many prisoners. As the dead and wounded of the defeated party were insignificant in numbers, it may be conjectured that the Carlists were surprised, and that those who were not taken lost no time in effecting their escape. It is difficult to judge whether the combat is to be regarded as decisive of the fate of the insurrection; but according to the latest accounts the insurgents are greatly discouraged. It was never supposed that the Carlists were capable of meeting the Government forces in the open field, except with an accidental and overwhelming superiority of numbers. If they can hamper the movements of SERRANO and intercept his convoys, they may hope to be able to maintain a desultory struggle during the summer, and that in the meantime the

Republicans, or some other malcontent faction, may perhaps effect a diversion in their favour. The kingdom has been largely drained of men to supply the urgent demands of Cuba; and it is said that there are at present only 30,000 soldiers on Spanish soil. A third of the number present in the field will probably be required to pacify the disturbed provinces, and some difficulty will be experienced when it becomes necessary to draw on the reserves. There is at present no symptom of a tendency to desertion or defection, and an army in the field may be more implicitly trusted to follow its colours than in the idleness of barrack life. The insurrection seems at a distance to be extremely rash; but it must have been thought by its leaders to present some prospect of success. A few officers of rank and experience have accepted commands under DON CARLOS, probably without any intention of devoting themselves to an entirely hopeless cause. The memory of the civil war of thirty years ago can afford but faint encouragement to the Carlist leaders. At that time modern heresies and innovations had made little progress, and the influence of the Church was far greater than at present. ZUMALACARREGUY was superior in ability to any of the Christina generals, and CABRERA and some of the other Carlist chiefs displayed considerable energy. Nevertheless the Royalists were never able to occupy either a considerable town or any of the Central or Southern provinces. If MAROTO had not sold his sovereign to the enemy at Bergara, the war might have been prolonged for two or three years; but it had long before become evident that the cause of the QUEEN must finally prevail. The Duke of MADRID appeals to passions and prejudices which are rapidly becoming obsolete against a constitutional system which, notwithstanding many revolutions and one change of dynasty, has been established for an entire generation. In the interval neither the disreputable character of the Court nor the intrigues of factions have greatly impeded the advance of prosperity. Since the death of FERNAND VII., Spain has probably increased in wealth in a larger proportion than France, Germany, or England.

If SERRANO succeeds in suppressing the rebellion, the petty conflict will probably have contributed to the security of the throne. The army will have had an opportunity of displaying its fidelity; and the heads of the dynastic parties at Madrid have already been compelled to suspend their intrigues for a moment. The Republicans, on the other hand, are using their utmost efforts to excite agitation, and their principal club or representative body has, as if in anticipation of a crisis, ostentatiously delegated its powers to its President. Nevertheless SAGASTA ought to profit by the defeat of the least formidable enemy of the Government. The alleged irregularities of the general election will have been forgotten in the excitement of a war, although the conflict may have been on a petty scale. All the popular commonplaces are on the side of liberty, of democracy, and of every theory which is repudiated by DON CARLOS and his partisans. The cry of "Death to the foreigner!" is perhaps effective in Biscay and Navarre; but, although Spaniards may not generally entertain liberal feelings to aliens, the elected KING is hardly more of a stranger than the Duke of MADRID, and he is less of an intruder. Although the Republicans in Spain, as in France, have always proclaimed the divine right of their favourite institution, they have never attempted, except in a few isolated outbreaks, to impose their doctrine on their countrymen by force. All reasonable persons will regard as criminal the promotion of a civil war for objects which, if they were desired by the majority of the people, might be attained by peaceful means. When PRIM spent nearly two years in hunting for a King, the friends of the Duke of MADRID had an opportunity of urging claims which must have been recognized if they had been acknowledged by the country at large. In the first freely elected Cortes after the expulsion of Queen ISABELLA the Carlists formed but an inconsiderable section. As long as the insurgents remain in their own mountains, they may perhaps maintain the struggle; but even if they had defeated SERRANO's army, they would be invading a hostile country when they ventured to march on Madrid. Although the Spaniards are said to be hostile to centralization, they are not so indifferent to national unity as to tolerate the virtual separation of the Northern provinces from the monarchy. Sooner or later the insurrection will be inevitably suppressed, and it is for the interest of all parties that the struggle should be as brief as possible. It may be worth the while of the Government to understand the causes which have induced a portion of the population to revolt. It is scarcely to be supposed that men risk their lives or that women send their sons into the field merely through religious enthusiasm,

or in disinterested devotion to an unknown prince whose last reigning ancestor was CHARLES IV. Their grievances must be of a more solid kind, and probably they are in some degree well founded. It may be practicable for the Cortes to remove chronic dissatisfaction when armed resistance is finally suppressed. It will not be possible to satisfy the section of the priesthood which resents all modern infringements of clerical privileges; but, except in the districts which have returned Carlist members to Congress, the clergy would seem to have little political power. In Spain, as in other countries, owners of property and men of business prefer any tolerable Government which happens to exist to almost any alternative. King AMADEO may not be regarded with deep attachment, but he has been regularly and legally chosen as King; and his adversaries are as much opposed to the sovereignty of the Cortes as to the candidate whom they selected on the recommendation of PRIM.

If the Duke of MADRID is not likely to confer valuable services on Spain, either as an august master or as a rebel pretender, he may boast that he has already effected an important object in rendering the finances even less prosperous than usual. The cost of suppressing the insurrection will perhaps be smaller than the losses which must have been incurred through the disturbance of tranquillity, and the diminution of the credit of the Government. Spanish finances are not in ordinary times flourishing, and they will have received a fresh shock through the Carlist war, which unsettles business, while it both diminishes the revenue and largely increases the national expenditure. The mountaineers who follow the Carlist flag know nothing about the funds, but one of the objects of their rebellion is probably to avoid the payment of taxes, which it will for the present not be easy to collect. It is also not unlikely that the insurgents of Cuba may have occasion to regard Don CARLOS as their ultimate liberator. As long as a considerable force is required to suppress the Carlist rebellion, it will be difficult to detach reinforcements to Cuba. The conscription is always unpopular in Spain, and it must at least be necessarily interrupted in the disturbed districts. If the name and pretensions of the Duke of MADRID are known in the colony, they will suggest the suspicion that the restoration of absolute monarchy in Spain would not be favourable to the cause of emancipation in Cuba. The malcontents in the island are perhaps more likely to be encouraged to further perseverance by the knowledge that the Government of the Mother-country is harassed by domestic conflicts. The rebellion was first caused by the tidings of the September Revolution, although the Provisional Government can scarcely have been more obnoxious than the dynasty which was overthrown to the discontented part of the community. The energy which has since been displayed in the despatch of troops by PRIM and his successor has probably surprised and disappointed the insurgent colonists. Any interruption in the flow of reinforcements, and even any expectation that the resources of the Government were exhausted, would lead to fresh efforts on the part of the rebels, and furnish an additional pretext for interference to their foreign sympathizers. Whether the loss of Cuba would really be an injury to Spain is a question which has no concern with the patriotic character of the efforts of Don CARLOS.

There is some satisfaction in noting the changes which have taken place in international policy since the grandfather of the actual Pretender was engaged in a similar attempt. At that time it seemed to France, and especially to England, an object of paramount importance that the constitutional government which had been unwillingly conceded by FERDINAND VII. should be maintained and administered in the name of his daughter. Several years of incessant diplomacy were devoted to the establishment of the throne of ISABELLA, and the questionable enterprise of the Foreign Legion proved that the English Government had for once determined to pursue a benevolent neutrality, to the disadvantage of Don CARLOS. In the present day no foreign Power dreams of the possibility of interfering in a struggle which, however lamentable, regards the interests and wishes of the Spaniards alone. If, in defiance of all probability, Don CARLOS could make himself in fact, as by professed right, King of SPAIN, his title and Government would be acknowledged without the smallest hesitation. It is not for the interest of the Spaniards themselves that strangers should meddle with their domestic quarrels; yet it may be permissible to feel regret for the perversity which renders it impossible for a KING of promising abilities and of high character to commence the task of restoring order and harmony in Spain. The present insurrection appears to have nothing of the probability of success which can alone justify the promotion of civil war.

#### ARMY CONTRACTS IN FRANCE.

AT the end of last week the Duke of AUDRIFET PASQUIER made, as Reporter of the Commission appointed to examine into army contracts, a speech which produced a very startling effect in the Assembly. At the end of his address he was embraced by men of all parties, votes accepting his conclusions were unanimously adopted, and he was the hero of the hour. His revelations chiefly concerned the Empire, and an exposure of the scandals of Imperial misgovernment is equally welcome to the Right and to the Left. First of all he had to speak of a system which has long prevailed in French official life. When a contract is to be made, the Government, instead of buying directly what it wants with its own money, finds some one to make the bargain for it; and this person, according to the amount of interest he possesses, puts more or less into his own pocket by the transaction. Some very curious and edifying examples, mainly belonging to the epoch when the conduct of the German war was still in Imperial hands, were furnished to the Chamber. The Duke began by entertaining his hearers with a history of what he called the *affaire CHOLLET*. M. CHOLLET was a bankrupt dealer in vegetables, who seemed only to have to present himself at the War Office to get a contract for a supply of guns and cartridges by which he cleared nearly 100,000l. He was troubled with no surveillance, and he was allowed to supply exactly what articles he pleased; and as he had no ready money, the Office kindly advanced him a million of francs to start with. Then there was a M. HEDLEY, who "felt a wish for a contract for cartridges." He took a contract at a hundred francs for so many cartridges; but it immediately occurred to him that he was by no means getting the splendid bargain to which he was entitled. So he got a certain friendly Count to intercede for him, and this gentleman's influence was so powerful that, without any further inquiry or discussion, the figures 180 were substituted for 100. The price at which independent firms were then tendering similar cartridges to the Government was 87 francs; so that M. HEDLEY made an excellent thing by having so good a friend at Court. Then there was a M. LARIVIÈRE, who got another contract for cartridges, but whose cartridges never arrived. A Government agent, however, certified that they were on board a certain ship, and M. LARIVIÈRE got a large sum paid him. When the ship arrived there was nothing but sugar on board her. Ultimately M. LARIVIÈRE did furnish some cartridges, but he did not send them till the war was over, and then they were immediately stored in a damp cellar, so that when the Commission attempted to ascertain what they were like, it was found that they were so spoilt that there was no making out what they had been worth. Even, however, under the Empire the highest authorities set themselves in a feeble way against such jobs. But the officials ignored the views of their superiors, and gave contracts and shared plunder as they pleased. The EMPEROR and Marshal RANDON on one occasion expressly forbade a contract by which a firm was to receive a commission of fifteen per cent. on muskets made with State funds under State inspection. But the firm got the contract all the same. The officials claim, in fact, a sort of right to do as they please, and have even tried to baffle the Commission of the Assembly. They tried to stop a prosecution which the MINISTER of WAR ordered to be instituted, and they very nearly succeeded. A captain was found to have been a party to a job, and he was reported to his commanding officer, who thereon immediately made him his *adjoint-de-camp*. Another officer volunteered to give information, and he was immediately made to feel the displeasure of his regimental authorities. As the Duke said with pitiful truth, Governments change, Empires fall, Ministers pass away; but the Bureaux remain, and intolerable abuses always co-exist with them. The first step to combat the abuses of Bureaux is to expose them; this the Commission has done with unsparring severity, and the Duke successfully appealed to the Assembly to pronounce that this was the true course, and that it might be hoped that a nation which has the courage to go down to the depths of the mischiefs preying on it is in a fair way to rid itself of them.

Evidently, however, histories of jobs perpetrated here and there, and entertaining tales of scandals with regard to particular contracts, only lead to the further question, what is the general state of affairs of which they are the symptoms? The Commission was led step by step to occupy itself with the wide issue of the real condition of the French army in regard to the supply of materials and equipments, when the EMPEROR chose, in a moment of profound peace, to challenge Germany

to fight. The Commission had to investigate what contracts had been made, what articles had been supplied, and what had become of those articles. In order to ascertain this, it was necessary to know what was the stock in hand when war was declared. The figures on paper seemed to show that the supply of materials in the summer of 1870 was by no means inadequate; but then what could have become of all these materials? An official statement put the cannon disposable for a campaign at 10,000, which was a most creditable and perhaps even excessive quantity. But then, on further inquiry, 7,000 of these cannon melted into thin air; and it appeared on equally good official authority that there were really less than 3,000. So, again, the official estimate of rifles in stock was nearly three millions and a half, but in fact there were only a million. Nor was this all. The fortresses most exposed to the enemy appear to have been absolutely destitute of most things that ought to have been in them. At Strasburg, supposed to be the great arsenal of Eastern France, there were scarcely any means of repairing a gun. The Commission only touched on this great subject, however, and recommended that a special Commission should be appointed by the Assembly to probe the matter to the bottom. Not only was this recommendation warmly welcomed, but the Assembly, without a moment's hesitation, conferred on the Commission of which the Duke was the Reporter the honourable office of itself making the inquiry. M. ROUHER, who was absent, but who spoke on a subsequent day, said that if he had been present he should have voted in harmony with the rest of the Assembly. If an inquiry is to be made into the military administration of the Empire, it was much better that the friends of the Empire should seem delighted that such an inquiry should be made. It is, indeed, the Imperial theory that the EMPEROR failed in 1870 because he had been betrayed. He believed in the 10,000 cannon and the three million and a-half of rifles. He thought Strasburg was full of every kind of material of war. He felt sure that his soldiers would get everything they could need in a campaign from his admirable organization of supply. When the critical moment came, he found out that he had been cheated, deceived, befooled in every possible way. A good Sovereign outwitted by evil-minded subordinates is the character which since Sedan the EMPEROR has always tried to assume in the eyes of scornful France. No doubt he was cheated, deceived, and betrayed; but there are one or two things to be remembered as to this Imperial plea which France cannot forget. It is the one business of an Emperor not to be cheated and betrayed. If he offers himself as the one man capable of guiding such a country as France aright provided that everything is left to him, he abandons the very ground on which he has rested his claim to power when he owns that he has been a helpless tool of scheming, jobbing, lying officials.

The Commission had some suggestions to offer for the improvement of army administration, so that the evils of the future shall at least be less than those of the past. Everything they suggested was so rapturously received and approved by the Assembly that it is difficult to say what is the real value of suggestions that were exempt from criticism. It is not for want of a machinery for good administration that the military administration of France is so deplorably bad. There are most admirable regulations on every conceivable point; only no one thinks of attending to them. There is a Department of Control, but then the departments which it is intended to control politely ignore its existence. The Commission recommend two main changes. They wish that the regulations under which the army is to be controlled should be put into the form of a law, so that, if anything goes wrong, the Minister at the head of the department may be made directly responsible. We confess that this does not seem much of a remedy, for the Minister may be made responsible in whatever shape the regulations are framed, and the proposal seems not unlikely to lead the Assembly first into going out of its proper province and meddling with details belonging to the Executive, and then getting tired of so hopeless a task and letting the Executive do exactly what it pleases. Further, it is proposed that there should be a system of control by civilians entirely independent of the army, who shall ascertain that the State gets value for every halfpenny it lays out for stores. We can only say that if this does not plunge the French army into a chaos of red-tape it will be exceedingly lucky. But the remedies on which the Commission lays most stress are of a much more heroic character. The real safeguard against fraudulent army contracts, in the opinion of the Duke and his colleagues, lies in the adoption of the universal obligation of Frenchmen to form part of the

army. The Assembly was most enthusiastic in its approbation of the suggestion, and the difficulties of M. THIERS, if he still wishes to oppose the general desire for compulsory service without exemptions, have been no doubt seriously increased by the success accorded to the appeal of the Duke. It might have seemed as if the French, who used to pique themselves on their gift for organization, could have managed to get their army supplied honestly and adequately with stores, whatever might be the principle on which it was raised. But the French have taken it into their heads that the military service of the whole adult male population will make France moral, and that nothing else will. The mainspring of fraudulent army contracts, the Duke and his hearers seemed to argue, is the dishonesty of fraudulent contractors; but if there are no exemptions from conscription, every one will be honest, and so there can be no more fraudulent contracts. Whether universal military service would be a good thing or a bad thing for France is a matter of grave consideration; but it is unsatisfactory to find that its admirers worship it as a kind of fetish before it has begun to exist, and that in their almost infantine belief that they have hit on a perfect plan for making honest men of thieves, they omit to balance the disadvantages against the advantages of making every man a soldier in a country where the elements of civil war seem dangerously strong and numerous already.

#### THE CORRESPONDENCE WITH CANADA.

**A** CORRESPONDENCE between the COLONIAL SECRETARY and the Canadian Ministry has led to a modified acceptance by the English Government of a proposal that it should guarantee a loan of moderate amount for the construction of an inter-oceanic railroad. As in the majority of money bargains, there was some higgling as to the amount of the guarantee, but the Canadian Ministers have prudently accepted Lord KIMBERLEY's offer of 2,500,000*l.* in answer to their request for 4,000,000*l.* The Canadians have at the same time been assured that any recommendation on the part of the Government to terminate certain articles of the Treaty would be acted upon, and that the greatest deference will be paid to the wishes of the Dominion. It would perhaps have been better to have been more liberal, especially as the high credit of the Dominion affords ample security against ultimate loss. It would even have been worth while to incur a moderate pecuniary risk as a just penalty for one of the gravest among many miscarriages involved in the unfortunate capitulation of Washington. The Canadians were reasonably discontented both with the provisions and with the omissions of the Treaty, as far as their own interests were concerned; and, as the Canadian Minister significantly remarked, "they have failed to discover that in the settlement of the so-called *Alabama* claims England gained such advantages as to be required to make further concessions at the expense of Canada." Although Lord KIMBERLEY makes the best of his case, he is evidently conscious that throughout the correspondence the Canadians are indisputably in the right. Their Ministers deserve credit for good temper which is not inconsistent with firmness, as well as for their prudence in obtaining an economical advantage which may afford some compensation for the unequal operation of the Treaty. During the negotiation the Commissioners made concessions at the expense of Canada, as if in consideration for the still larger sacrifices to which they pledged the Imperial Government. Having altered the rules of international law, having given the newfangled doctrines a retrospective operation, and having offered an apology for acts which had previously been avowed and justified as lawful, the English representatives at once acquiesced in the flat refusal of their American colleagues to include in the Treaty compensation for the piratical invasions of Canada. They also surrendered the right of the Dominion to exclusive possession of its own inshore fisheries, on condition of a colourable equivalent in American waters, and of a money payment. The concession of the fisheries was necessarily made contingent on the approval of the Canadian Parliament; but it would be dangerous for Canada to insist on the maintenance of a right which had been conceded in principle by the Imperial Government.

The remonstrance of the Canadian Ministry against the tame abandonment of the claims for damage through the Fenian invasion is not only unanswerable, but unanswered. Lord KIMBERLEY had referred to the rules relating to neutral duties during war, but "the (Canadian) Committee of Privy Council, judging from past experience, are much more apprehensive

"of misunderstanding owing to the apparent difference of opinion between Canada and the United States as to the relative duties of friendly States in time of peace." On two or three occasions the United States authorities have allowed troops to be publicly organized and armed for the purpose of invading Canada; and "there seems no reason to hope that the United States Government will perform its duty as a friendly neighbour any better in the future than in the past." The Imperial Government has never taken any vigorous measures for the protection of Canada. "On the contrary, while, in the opinion of the Government and the entire people of Canada, the Government of the United States neglected, until much too late, to take the necessary measures to prevent the Fenian invasion of 1870, HER MAJESTY'S Government hastened to acknowledge by cable telegram the prompt action of the PRESIDENT and to thank him for it." Exaggerated deference and undue eagerness to conciliate the goodwill of the American people largely account for the systematic encroachments which have lately culminated in the demand for consequential damages. The reclamations of the Canadian Government against the claims relating to the fisheries are less forcible, inasmuch as the case was more complicated, and also because the concession is nominally subject to the approval of the Parliament of the Dominion. The exclusive right of the Canadian fishermen, having been formally acknowledged by the Treaty of 1818, was suspended in exchange for commercial privileges in 1854, to revive on the denunciation by the Americans themselves in 1863 of the Reciprocity Treaty. The American fishermen have since been provisionally admitted on payment of license fees; but the restrictions have of late been systematically neglected or invaded; and there was frequent risk both of casual collisions and of wilful outrages promoted by American agitators. The American Commissioners declared that Congress would not sanction any relaxation of protective duties; and, as Lord KIMBERLEY argues, commercial reforms are more likely to be permanent and effective when they result from a conviction of the expediency of Free-trade than when they are made the subject of negotiation and barter. It only remained either to insist on the maintenance of existing rights, or to waive them for a pecuniary consideration. The decision of the Commissioners would have been defensible if it had been previously approved by the Canadian Parliament.

With a self-control which indicates practical statesmanship, the Canadian Ministers content themselves with their argumentative triumph, and proceed to make the best use of a legitimate grievance. Among the various liabilities which are likely to result from the Washington Treaty, it would be unreasonable to object to a guarantee which will enure to the benefit of friends and fellow-subjects and not of litigious adversaries. As a reason or excuse for the concession, the Canadian Committee of Privy Council remind Lord KIMBERLEY that when the Western territories are opened by the Pacific Railroad they will sustain an enormous number of settlers. The population of the United States is tenfold that of Canada, and the inhabitants of the Dominion consume in proportion to their numbers three times as great a value of British products as the citizens of the United States. It is not perhaps a convincing argument in favour of a guarantee that the proposed railroad might perhaps convey the English mails to certain parts of the East. A better reason for the concession than the hope of postal or commercial advantages is supplied by the expediency of atoning for a diplomatic failure by a measure which will gratify Canadian feeling. Whether the connexion between the Mother-country and the Dominion is to last for one generation or for an indefinite period, no effort ought to be spared to cultivate the loyal goodwill of the Canadians to the English nation and the Crown. The animosity which has survived for nearly a century the independence of the other North American provinces is not the less a misfortune because it has been fostered by the ignorance and prejudice of an imperfectly educated community. The Americans perversely resent the natural reluctance of GEORGE III. and his countrymen to permit the disruption of the Empire. Colonists in the present day are frequently irritated by the opposite error of pedantic politicians who contend that the retention of distant dependencies is unprofitable and occasionally burdensome. It is fortunate that the new GOVERNOR-GENERAL of Canada is not likely to be insensible to imaginative influences and to Imperial sympathies. Lord DUFFERIN will never go out of his way to remind the Canadians that they may detach themselves from their allegiance without fear of coercion.

The Correspondence on the Treaty and the proposed guarantee illustrates the new constitutional relation which has

arisen both in Canada and in the Australian colonies from the modern experiment of so-called responsible government. The Cabinet which, while it has absorbed the whole executive power of the Crown, has still no recognized place in the English Constitution, assumes in Canada, under its proper title of the Committee of Privy Council, an independent character in which it corresponds and negotiates with the Imperial Government. In theory the Governor-General selects his Ministers, though they are necessarily, as in England, the leaders of the Parliamentary majority; but, while it is his business to obey the instructions of the Crown, the Committee of Privy Council is already recognized as the authorised representative of the Parliament and people. A minute of the English Cabinet is intended only for the guidance of its members, except on the rare occasions on which a collective resolution of the Ministers is submitted to the Sovereign. A minute of the Canadian Committee of Privy Council, formally approved by the Governor-General, is a State paper embodying the decision of the Government on the most important affairs. It is convenient that a Ministerial body should be interposed between the Colonial Parliament and the Home Government; and there is a strong presumption in favour of institutions which owe their origin to practical expediency rather than to deliberate and theoretical legislation. The successive statesmen who, sometimes through indolence, and sometimes in accordance with their convictions, conceded responsible government to the colonies, probably persuaded themselves that the intercourse between the Secretary of State and the colonies would afterwards, as in former times, be conducted by the Governor. As the Ministers now exercise the chief political power, it is desirable that their position should be acknowledged, and also that colonial statesmen should be known to those who hold office at home. The Canadian Committee of Privy Council apparently consists of sagacious men of business who regard substantial advantages as the best results of a dialectic victory.

#### MR. GORDON'S VICTORY.

IN the position in which the Government now stands the Conservatives were wise for the moment when they determined to support Mr. Gordon's impracticable and almost meaningless Resolution. Nothing can make the fall of the Ministry more certain than the growth of an impression that there is not a single question upon which they can count with any confidence upon getting a majority. Until last Monday Mr. FORSTER's educational policy seemed to be the solitary fortress which they could regard as impregnable. Now this has proved as weak as the rest, and if the Government can still claim to be the stronger party in the House of Commons, it must be with the serious qualification that their strength usually fails them when it is most needed. Though the unlucky result of Monday's division is no doubt mainly due to the irritation caused by the fanatical hostility of Secularist and Dissenting zealots to religious education, it must also be attributed in part to the serious tactical blunder of which the Government were guilty in maintaining an almost unbroken silence throughout the debate. It is not an easy matter to keep a party together till past midnight without allowing them to hear their own voices. Nor can we believe that if Mr. FORSTER had from the first given the discussion the importance which, as the result proved, really belonged to it, the Conservatives would have given Mr. GONZON such an undivided vote. For reasons to be presently stated, the adoption of the Resolution would, if it could possibly be regarded as serious, be a heavy blow to the cause of national education even in England; and if the fact had been clearly brought out, there must have been some members of the Opposition who would have felt that this was too great a price to pay even for the pleasure of putting the Government in a minority. As it was, there were no timely reminders to check the excited zeal of assailants who saw victory within their grasp. The debate began and ended with scarcely a reference to the graver issues which underlay the terms of the motion. The only reason assigned by Mr. FORSTER for declining the challenge offered to him was his desire not to waste time by discussing, before going into Committee, a subject which he maintained could be more conveniently discussed in Committee. If there could be no such thing as a one-sided debate, this argument might have had some weight. Inasmuch, however, as the Opposition had it in its power to waste time in discussing without any aid from the other side, the argument had been overturned by the time that Mr. FORSTER rose. Even if the

division had been in favour of the Government, the evening would have been lost just as much as though their supporters had not been tongue-tied. If the consequences of Mr. GORDON's Resolution had been thoroughly sifted, the passage of the Bill into Committee would not have been more delayed than it has been by the course actually taken, and the Committee would not have had to begin its labours with a millstone tied about its neck.

The defeats sustained by Mr. DIXON and Mr. CANDLISH, and the dislike evidently felt by the majority of Englishmen to the arrogant pretensions put forward by the Manchester Conference, have unfortunately had their natural effect in turning the heads of the Conservatives. Hitherto they have taken their stand on the English Education Act, as embodying the best practicable settlement of the religious difficulty. They have assented to the impossibility of any direct teaching of religion by the State, and have found in the liberty accorded to each locality to teach what religion it thinks fit a substantial, if imperfect, recognition of the value of religious training. It was to be expected, therefore, that when a Scotch Education Bill, identical in all its essential features with the English measure, was brought forward by the Government, the Opposition would give it an equally cordial support. That the Secularists should oppose it was only consistent, for it reproduced in a stronger form the absolute freedom of every School Board to teach religious dogma. But that the men who have identified themselves with the Elementary Education Act as completely as though it had been their own production; who have defended it, in and out of Parliament, as the very mainstay of religious teaching against Secularism; who have cheered Mr. FORSTER's repeated declarations that from the principle of the Act of 1870 the Government would not stir a single step—that these men should join in denouncing an Education Bill because it leaves every parish free to deal with the religious difficulty as it pleases, is a revolution for which we were not prepared, and which even now it is difficult to regard as a literal fact. The true significance of the Conservative attitude upon Mr. GORDON's motion hardly came out in the debate. No attempt was made by any of the speakers to show why a settlement of the religious difficulty which has been generally accepted in England ought to be rejected as unholy in Scotland. The Conservative journals have been less reticent, and, if we are to accept their version of Monday night's division, the Opposition now think themselves strong enough to repudiate the compromise into which they entered in 1870. That compromise, so sacred in their eyes not three months ago, is now denounced as a futile attempt to meet the enemies of Denominational religion half way, and an ignoble compact with the foes of truth and religion; while the educational policy to which, when the Government were strong, the Conservative organs paid so many flattering compliments, is now described as a systematic attack on religion, none the less bitter and relentless because Mr. FORSTER pretends that it is an effort for its defence. The morality of this change of front is not worth criticism; but the consequences of the change will certainly be embarrassing, and may possibly be serious. It is impossible for a political party to take the line taken by the Opposition on Monday, and yet to find fault with the Education League for disturbing the compromise of 1870. If the Dissenters and the Secularists have tried to disturb the compromise, the Conservatives and the Denominationalists—so far as they are represented by the Conservatives—have, in words at least, utterly torn it up. For the time the current of public feeling may be in their favour. They may construct a Scotch Education Bill after their own hearts, and then go on to alter and amend the English Education Act. But, if this is to be their policy, the punishment that falls on men who repudiate compromises when they think themselves too strong to need them will certainly overtake them in the end. By and by popular sympathy will once more have gone round, and a Liberal Government will again find itself confronted by educational difficulties. It will be vain for it to propose to meet them by another compromise, for the Secularists will say, and say truly, that the Conservatives cannot be trusted to abide by a compromise a moment longer than it happens to suit their purpose. The educational strength of the country will be hopelessly arrayed in hostile camps, and the progress of popular education will be suspended, that the rival factions may fight their battle out.

It is some satisfaction to think that this betrayal of the cause of education is sure to bring with it its own punishment. We said that the Conservatives were wise for the moment in supporting Mr. GORDON's Resolution; but, considering the obvious tendency, if not the inevitable conse-

quences, of the act, that moment will be a very brief one. Mr. HARDY put forward the one plea on which the adoption of such a Resolution could be justified when he challenged Mr. FORSTER to prove that, because certain principles were enacted in the English Bill, they should be necessarily enacted also in the Scotch Bill. It may be maintained no doubt, with much show of reason, that so long as Scotland wishes to have Presbyterianism taught at the public expense in every national school, the fact that in England the school authorities in every district are allowed to teach the religion professed by the local majority, or, if they prefer it, none at all, is nothing to the purpose. But if this absolute educational independence is to be accorded to one of the three kingdoms, it cannot in any fairness be refused to another. The Scotch are not more deeply attached to Presbyterianism than the Irish are to Roman Catholicism, and if to please the former the Imperial Parliament is to pass a Bill providing for the teaching of Presbyterianism in every school in Scotland, common consistency will demand that to please the latter it shall pass a Bill providing for the teaching of Roman Catholicism in every Irish school. In all probability it will fall to the lot of a Conservative Government to deal with the Education question in Ireland. It is difficult to believe that if the Conservatives had realized this prospect more clearly, they would have spoken as they spoke on Monday. They have refused to plant in Scotland a system as secular as the English, because the Scotch wish their religion to be taught universally. Are they prepared to maintain in Ireland a system far more secular than the English when the Irish wish precisely the same thing as the Scotch? It is not wise to quarrel with compromises until you are quite sure that they will not be wanted again. On the whole, we can quite understand that the Conservatives vastly liked the twofold sport of beating the Government and snubbing the Secularists; but we hardly think that the evening's enjoyment was of a kind to bear the morning's reflection.

#### M. THIERS AND THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

M. THIERS seems bent upon showing that historians, unlike history, constantly repeat themselves. He cannot throw off his habit of threatening to retire from office whenever he has failed in getting the Assembly to do what he wishes. The vote by which the nomination of the members of the Council of State is vested in the Assembly instead of in the Executive has furnished him with another occasion for waving his favourite weapon in the eyes of the Deputies. The PRESIDENT has allowed it to become known that his retention of office depends on the action of the Assembly upon the third reading of the Bill. If the hint is taken in a proper spirit, and the recent decision is reversed, all will be forgotten. If the Assembly stands by its vote, M. GRIVY will again receive the PRESIDENT's resignation. It will be no wonder if the Assembly should prove to have lost faith in these repeated threats. They have been so often uttered, and so invariably withdrawn, that they cannot but have lost something of their original power. Whether M. THIERS does or does not mean what he says at the moment of saying it, this method of managing the Assembly is equally to be regretted. M. THIERS is something more than a Minister, and he has no right to divest himself of the more than Ministerial obligations which belong to his position. He embodies in his own person the whole Government. Cabinets may resign, for the vote which ejects them from office virtually designates the politicians who are to take their place. Kings may abdicate, for their crowns will devolve by force of law upon their ascertained heirs. The Presidents of ordinary Republics may lay down their office, for the process of electing a successor is defined and understood. But M. THIERS has no leader of Opposition ready to take his place; the Provisional King has no ascertained heir waiting to mount the throne; and it has not yet been decided who is to elect the President's successor, or whether he is to have a successor at all. In such a state of things as this a sudden resignation on the part of M. THIERS might be equivalent to a proclamation of anarchy. It is hard to believe that any patriotic statesman can deliberately contemplate an act so fraught with disastrous possibilities. Resignation seems to be the one step which circumstances absolutely forbid M. THIERS to take. It is conceivable that he might be driven to dissolve the Assembly by a *coup d'état*; for the inability of the Executive to get at the real opinion of the country by means of a general election is so monstrous a defect in constitutional machinery that a ruler may be pardoned for consulting the spirit of representative government

in preference to the letter. It is conceivable again that, rather than have recourse to this extreme measure, he might bring an amount of pressure to bear upon the Deputies which in ordinary cases would be wholly illegitimate. A President who is denied the commonplace expedient of a dissolution may be excused if he resorts to strange methods of controlling an Assembly which he has no regular means of sending to its constituents. But to retire from office does not even cut the knot of a difficulty. It may gratify the irritated feelings of M. THIERS, but, with this single exception, it can only exaggerate existing evils. Yet if we suppose M. THIERS to appreciate these objections to the course which he talks of taking, and consequently to have no real intention of taking it, he cannot be acquitted of a grave fault of another kind. He is treating the Assembly as a nurse treats a naughty child—he threatens to go away and leave it to itself unless it promises to be good directly. There is no need to inquire whether the French Assembly deserves this treatment. It is enough to say that it is not a child, and that its faults cannot be corrected like the faults of children. The great want of France at the present moment is that the nation should get accustomed to respect and submit to the decisions of a representative body. It cannot be expected that political parties should learn this lesson when the example of despising such a body is set them by the PRESIDENT himself.

The particular vote which M. THIERS is anxious to have rescinded is one which need never have been given if he had been wise enough to let the constitution of the Council of State alone. A great deal has been written in this country about the inconsistency of the French Liberals in wishing to retain the Council of State as an agent of administration. What, it has been asked, can be more laughable than to see Republicans trying to strengthen the hands of the Executive by setting up afresh a power which has heretofore been able to reverse the acts of the Legislature itself? It would need a very careful and exhaustive examination of the incidents of government in France to determine the validity of this objection. Much is done there by the central authority which in England is done by the local authorities, or left altogether undone; and it may be necessary that the central authority should have a stronger instrument at its disposal than would be wanted in a system under which less was expected from it. Whatever may be the motives of individual Republicans in giving increased powers to the Executive, it cannot be denied that a strong Government is at least as necessary under a Republic as under any other form of polity. In France especially one main reason why Republics have hitherto failed is that this essential requisite has been wanting. No doubt there has often been great need of some better protection of individual liberty against executive encroachment, but there are other and more effectual ways of securing this end than by simply weakening the authority against the abuse of which it is desired to guard. Nor can there be much question that, if there is a Council of State at all, its members ought to be named by the President and not by the Assembly. The object for which the Council of State exists is to assist the Executive in governing the country. The object for which a Council nominated by the Assembly would exist would be to act as a check upon the Executive in governing the country. It may be expedient that both, or neither, or one or other of these bodies should be created in France, but it is certain that the functions of the two are distinct. If the members of the Council of State are appointed by the Assembly, the Council will not answer the same purpose or play the same part as if they were appointed by the PRESIDENT. In other words, the Council will not be what has hitherto been understood by the Council of State; it will be much more like the Permanent Committee which the Assembly has instituted to keep watch on M. THIERS during the Parliamentary vacations. But while it is natural that M. THIERS should resent a process by which what he meant to be a weapon in the hands of the Executive has been converted into a check in the hands of the Assembly, it is his own doing that the controversy has been raised. Under the Government of the 4th of September the Council of State fell into abeyance, and since then such of its duties as had to be performed have been performed by a Provisional Committee. If M. THIERS had been content to leave well alone he would not have provoked a collision between himself and the Assembly. He has managed to rule France for more than a year without any regular Council of State, and there is nothing to show that he could not have gone on doing so with equal ease until the time when it will become necessary to decide under what institutions France is to live. M. THIERS insisted on dragging this solitary question from the obscurity which

veils the constitutional future of the country, and he has only himself to thank for the complications in which his restlessness has involved him.

#### THE SHUNTING OF THE PERMISSIVE BILL.

THE latest reinforcement to the Alliance comes from the National Assembly of France, which we are told has held "an interesting debate on inebriety." It is announced as a new and important discovery that there is drunkenness in Paris, "although France is a light-wine country." The fact does not surprise us, but we are curious to see what argument can be founded on it. The introduction of a Permissive Bill in France is hardly probable, although, if the principle of the Bill be sound, it ought to be capable of universal application. Let us imagine two-thirds of the inhabitants of a district resolving to discontinue wine-growing themselves, and to compel the other third to do the same. Or, to take an example nearer home, we may inquire what is to happen in Devonshire, where almost every farmer grows cider. Suppose that the Alliance send their most eloquent apostle into that county, and that he persuades a large majority that the apple pip is the seed of evil. We have heard of an attempt, which might be thought equally hopeful, to persuade the townsmen of Doncaster that horse-racing is wicked. But in order to test the principle of the Bill, we are entitled to assume that a majority of farmers determine to prevent a minority from growing cider. Of course we shall be told that the Bill only prohibits sale, and does not interfere with growth or manufacture. But we answer that, if so, the Bill is no better than a sham. A farmer who makes cider must either sell it or give it away, and from the point of view of the Alliance he is a heavier offender than the publican whom they so vehemently denounce. The effect of the application of a Permissive Act in a parish would be that "no licence whatever should be granted for the sale of alcoholic liquor" in that parish, neither to the wine-merchant proper, nor to the grocer, nor to the publican, nor to the beer-house keeper. The Alliance is so far consistent that it does not, like some other assailants of the publican, allow his competitor the grocer to escape. The only exemption which it contemplates is that of sellers of methylated spirit for use in art or manufacture, who may perhaps find themselves doing a considerable business after the adoption of the Act. Experience shows that deprivation of ordinary stimulants will drive those who are accustomed to them to adopt disagreeable and even dangerous substitutes. Whatever the heads of the medical profession may say upon this subject, we should fear that the body and tail of it would discover a disposition to prescribe for patients suffering under a Permissive Act "strengthening medicines," which druggists would be ready to supply. The evasion of the Act would be enormous, and a trade would spring up something like that which existed formerly in the West of England, where even the parson of the parish obtained—for we do not say he bought—spirits of a gang of smugglers. By a stroke of humour, the Bill proposes to subject liquor-dealers to Excise penalties, although it will deprive them of all benefit from Excise law. "Any person selling or disposing of any alcoholic liquor" shall be dealt with as selling without licence. The vagueness of the word "dispose" is perhaps more frightful than anything else. The operation sometimes described as "putting oneself outside liquor" appears capable of being included in it. Whatever the word comprises will be an "offence" subject to all the penalties provided by any existing statute for purposes either of revenue or police, which might easily amount to 100*l.* a day. Let us picture to ourselves the suspense of all dealers in a district during the canvass and voting on the adoption of the Act. If they escape this year they will be in equal peril next year, and they will be always liable to stoppage of their business at the expiration of the licence which they then hold—that is, within a year. Not only the sale of liquor to be consumed in the parish, but every sale of liquor within the parish will be prohibited. A dealer in a market town cannot supply a farmer who lives ten miles distant with a jar of whisky. The sale is complete when the jar is delivered to the farmer himself, or to his servant, or to a carrier by road or rail. The authors of the Bill did not perhaps mean all this, but they say it. They propose to turn the exciseman into a sort of attorney-general of the Alliance.

The only novelty in this week's debate on the Permissive Bill was that it did not finish. It does not matter much what may be the result of the division, if it ever takes place,

because the Bill is certain never to pass; and its supporters have told us that, whether they gain or lose votes as compared with last year, they will be stimulated to greater energy in years to come. They have, indeed, a happy faculty of making the best of everything for their own purpose. One provincial speaker approves the Bill because, if factory-hands were sober, they would not turn out; another approves it because they would. Sometimes we hear that drunkenness is increased by distress, and at other times that it is increased by plenty of work at high wages. The latest announcement is that the Commune came to grief through drink, and whether that effect was to be desired from that or any other cause is matter of opinion. We learn on the same authority that during the siege of Paris the National Guards, "not being well supplied with food, took to drinking," and they have, as soldiers say, continued the movement since the surrender. It is odd that an intelligent person should be able to make this statement without perceiving its application. There is a principle in human nature which demands alcoholic stimulants under circumstances of peculiar hardship. It is said that a distinguished general who was a teetotaller, being about to start on a difficult and hazardous expedition, directed his commissariat officer to be particular about the supply of rum. When preparations were made for the siege of Paris, the authorities doubtless collected all the wine and brandy they could lay hands on. Turning from the horrors of war to the festivities of peace, we find a supporter of the Permissive Bill remarking on the liberal presents of liquor sent to the refreshment department of a bazaar at Liverpool. It was, as we understand, the intention of the givers of this wine and beer that it should be sold retail for the benefit of some charity for which the bazaar was held. We regret to observe that this transaction, however laudable, would be a "selling or "disposing" of alcoholic liquor liable to the penalties of the Bill. This is a clear illustration of the impossibility of passing a measure which nevertheless certain members of Parliament support as "a step in the right direction." Some members doubtless mean, although they do not say, that the votes which they intend to give will make things pleasant for themselves, and will do no harm to anybody else. This at any rate was the notion which used to prevail in the House of Commons; but it has lately appeared that the choice between the Alliance and the publicans is like that between Scylla and Charybdis. The contrivance of discussing the Permissive Bill until it was too late to divide upon it is advantageous; but we greatly doubt whether any new feature can be introduced into the annual performance unless Sir WILFRID LAWSON will go to America and personally test the operation of the Prohibitory Law. We had thought a member of Parliament who desired this Bill to pass a strange animal; but a member who desired to hear more than one morning's talk about it must be stranger still. Another and even more remarkable variety of the Parliamentary mind is the member who contemplates the possibility of considering in Committee on the Bill the question of compensation to interests affected by it. We have heard of a claim to compensation by the landlord of the "Pickled Egg," whose business was affected by a railway. In such cases, if compensation is given at all, it is assessed liberally, and sometimes amounts to large sums. But it would be extravagant to propose that the ratepayers of a parish adopting a Permissive Act should pay compensation on a scale similar to that imposed on Railway Companies, or indeed on any scale at all.

It is in vain to disguise the character of this Bill. It seeks, as Mr. HENLEY said, to destroy a large existing trade which has been permitted to grow up in this country with the sanction of the Legislature, and which is founded on the ordinary and true principles of supply and demand. The spectacle of workmen devoting their leisure moments to the collection of signatures to petitions in favour of the Permissive Bill has, in the eyes of the author of that Bill, "something touching in it," and ought not to be laughed at. Certainly this spectacle would be no laughing matter to the publicans if the Bill as well as the agitation had "something touching" in it. But Parliament will never consent to place a vast property under liability to be destroyed by a chance vote of ratepayers. The owners of that property know that it can only be preserved by regulating the trade in which it is invested, and brewers and publicans appear alike desirous that a well-considered Licensing Bill should pass. The HOME SECRETARY is able to report that, by a stringent application of the Act for placing beer-house licences under magisterial control and of the Acts for the prevention of crime, a large number of the worst class of

liquor-shops has been closed. "The reduction in crime in certain districts has been out of all proportion to the reduction in the number of those houses, because the houses suppressed were the worst of all." If this be the first result of an obvious and easy reform, it is surely worth while to try for a few more years the effect of perseverance in the same unambitious course, instead of throwing the entire liquor trade of the Kingdom into an annual panic by a Permissive Act.

#### OUR FOREIGN VISITORS.

THESE are various indications that the tendency of recent events has been to shift the social as well as the financial meridian of Europe, and to make London more than ever the centre of affairs. Our capital has always been a tolerably cosmopolitan city, but the number of our foreign guests appears to be increasing in a remarkable degree. In all public places and large assemblies a Babel of strange tongues may now be heard. Of the French emigrants who were cast thither by the war and the Commune, many from choice or necessity still remain. Indeed, not a few Frenchmen at the present moment feel almost more at home in London than in Paris; and it is not perhaps surprising that the Germans should reckon upon a more agreeable reception here than in the city which was lately surrounded by their armies. There used to be a saying that good Americans expected, when they died, to go to Paris; but even the Americans are wavering in their allegiance. The democrats of the New World appear to be of opinion that it is hardly worth while to cross the Atlantic except to be presented at Court; they can shake hands with a President any day at home. However Paris may settle its relations with the rest of France—and the exile of M. THIERS and the Assembly at Versailles must soon draw to a close—it will be many years before it regains, if ever it does regain, its supremacy in Europe. Its importance for politicians has declined with its influence; and the financial world obeys a natural instinct in establishing its head-quarters on less volcanic soil. For pleasure-seekers of course Paris has still attractions, but even for this class it has lost much of its old charm; its gaiety is rebuked by painful associations, and the rapacity of its shopkeepers has been sharpened by a series of misfortunes and the pressure of augmented taxation into something like ferocity. Berlin has made a sudden start of late, but it can hardly hope to supplant Paris as the chief place of Europe; Vienna is under a cloud, and St. Petersburg is too remote. So, for the moment, it has come to pass that London is in fashion. The Germans who are kept away from Paris, and the French who will not go to Berlin, are willing to meet in London, and other nations find that the rendezvous is not an inconvenient one. If our city cannot boast of the amenities of Paris, it is not without attractions of its own, for those who understand it, and who do not expect it to be something which it is not, and cannot be. Its society is varied and interesting; and in recent years its appearance has certainly been improved. The Embankment has added to its dignity, and supplies a magnificent open terrace from which the city may be viewed; its Parks are more artistically managed than they used to be; and its environs in natural beauty have always been unsurpassed by those of any other capital. It has been so long the custom to disparage and abuse London as a bewildering labyrinth of dingy streets and a vast overgrown mass of houses, that people who now visit it for the first time are probably surprised to find how much better it is than they expected.

Our two most important guests at the present moment are the King of the BELGIANS and the German EMPRESS, who may perhaps be regarded as relations with whom no great ceremony need be used; and it is probably well that other Royal or Imperial personages should defer their visits until some arrangements can be made to give them a reception suitable to their rank. With Buckingham Palace hardly occupied, and Marlborough House not occupied at all, it rather jars on public feeling that the King of the BELGIANS, to whom everybody is anxious that attention should be shown, should have to put up at an hotel. The KING is no doubt as comfortable as he could desire to be, and the popular feeling on the subject is only a sentiment, but it is a sentiment which is not unreasonable. It is true, however, that the KING has been invited to Windsor, and the German EMPRESS has really been treated as a guest of the QUEEN. It is a small matter perhaps, but it may be observed that the *Court Circular*, in making HER MAJESTY Empress of, instead of in, Germany, confers on her a title which, we believe, is not recognized by her husband's subjects. It is well known that HER MAJESTY takes a deep interest in all benevolent and

philanthropic efforts; and during her brief stay in town her attention has been mainly directed to the management of our hospitals. The EMPRESS acquired great experience on this subject by her personal supervision, so anxious and incessant that it affected her health, of the military hospitals and the arrangements for the sick and the wounded during the war; and her testimony to the sound administration of the institutions which she has just visited is therefore valuable. There is no reason to regret that it has not been deemed necessary to entertain either the KING or the EMPRESS with an exhibition of military force. The melancholy absurdity of these displays when offered as a hospitable attention culminated when the late Emperor of the FRENCH drew out his troops as a pretty show for the KING of PRUSSIA, upon whom he was then meditating an attack, while the KING returned the compliment by sending his great KRUPP gun to be one of the chief ornaments of the Paris Exhibition. The visit of the King of the BELGIANS had its origin in an eminently peaceful object, for he came to preside at the annual dinner of the Royal Literary Fund. Mr. DISRAELI remarked on the agreeable inconsistency of a Sovereign presiding over the Republic of Letters; but there is no jealous MONROE doctrine to forbid the connexion; and it must be acknowledged that for geniality, good taste, and personal sympathy with the object in view, a better chairman than the King of the BELGIANS could not have been found. An English audience is naturally flattered by being addressed in its own tongue by a distinguished foreigner, and the KING, as his speeches showed, not only speaks English, but speaks it well. It was inevitable perhaps that an occasion of this kind should be largely used for mutual admiration. Mr. DISRAELI was good enough to give the "Sovereign Chairman," as he called him, a first-class certificate for constitutional qualities; and the KING returned the compliment by stating that he had heard his father say that the author of *Vivian Grey* was a man of talent. His MAJESTY also testified that he had himself found Lord STANHOPE'S historical writings very entertaining, and the observation was the more gracious as it presented his lordship's History in a new light. Lord STANHOPE in his turn expatiated on the political wisdom of the Belgians, but the evidence which he offered was of a somewhat negative character. It appears that some years back one of the Swiss Cantons fell under the control of a small despotic party, which, finding itself in a minority at a general election, decided that all who had abstained from voting should be numbered on the side of the Government, and thus made its minority a majority. It is true that nothing of this kind ever happened in Belgium, but this is surely rather a roundabout way of proving that the Belgians have always been distinguished for their love of freedom and their resolute adherence to constitutional principles.

Mr. DISRAELI did no more than justice to the wise statesmanship of LEOPOLD I, which, with his grateful attachment to England, his son has in no small degree inherited. It was the peculiar merit of the former that he knew exactly what it was proper and necessary to do within the limits prescribed, not merely by the letter, but by the spirit of the Constitution, and what it was well to leave undone. He never hesitated to exert his personal influence and to assume responsibility when it seemed to be probable that his intentions would be attended with good results; but he was also aware that the greatest service he could render his adopted country might be to go away for a time and leave the strife of parties to work itself out. His subjects used to be amused by the errant habits of *le roi voyageur*; but his travels were sometimes strokes of policy. A statesman of the calibre of LEOPOLD I is not reproduced in every generation, but his successor has already shown that he possesses much of his father's resolute tact and diplomatic judgment. The policy which secured the political neutrality of Belgium, and, as Mr. DISRAELI observed, consecrated to perpetual peace the battle-field of Europe, has certainly been successful; but this has been owing to the energy of Belgium as well as to the contingent protection of her allies. It has been said that a country that has no history may be supposed to have been happy; but the King of the BELGIANS, reversing the rule, suggests that the peacefulness and prosperity of England during the present reign render this period a particularly "magnificent theme" for the poet and the historian. It is true that peace has her triumphs as well as war, but it has usually been observed that poets and historians prefer to seek their inspiration in incidents of a more exciting character than those of quiet respectable domestic life. Whatever use may be made of the present reign by the poets and historians of the future, it is undeniable that it has itself been abundantly fruitful in literary results. Literature as an industry never was more active or

prosperous. It has been suggested that, as literature pays so well nowadays, it should not go begging for alms; but there is no reason, as far as we see, why all classes should not contribute to the relief of destitute and meritorious men of letters if they choose to do so; and it is known that the profits of literary labour are not invariably measured by its intrinsic value. In associating himself with this charitable work the King of the BELGIANS performed a genial act in a very graceful manner, and some unfortunate writers or their families will perhaps be the better for it; but it is perhaps rash to assume that it will make much difference as regards the general course of European politics.

#### THE PECULIAR PEOPLE.

THE "Peculiar People" who every now and then crop up in an obscure corner of our newspapers are not by themselves a very wonderful phenomenon. They are simply one more illustration of a truth which we ought to be in no danger of forgetting—the extraordinary vitality, namely, of forms of superstition long exploded amongst thinking people. The explanation is of course that a very small part of the population is really capable of thinking at any time, and that new ideas percolate down to the lower social strata with extreme difficulty. The people who are capable of rejecting the absurdities of witchcraft, or fortune-telling, or astrology, by their own unassisted powers, are a trifling minority; and of the great mass who are obliged to trust to the authority of their wiser and betters, few are capable even of appreciating the value of the authority. There is still as much soil as ever suitable to the growth of fine crops of superstition; the only difference is that not quite so many seeds are planted. We are more inclined to wonder at the rarity than at the occasional occurrence of queer forms of belief once supposed to be extinct. The fundamental tenet of the Peculiar People seems to be that not only is every word of the English Bible absolutely true, but that every fragment of a sentence taken by itself conveys a complete and unerring rule of practice. They are not so far removed from many persons who even make some pretensions to learning that we need wonder much at their peculiarities. Incidentally, however, their relations to the rest of mankind have suggested a problem of some interest. The Peculiar People think it wrong to call in medical assistance in cases of disease, and allow their children to die for the want of it. How far are we justified in interfering with this practice? and how far does the fact that it originates in a genuine religious belief render a course of conduct improper which would otherwise be permissible? The problem is not an important one in itself; but it involves some nice questions of casuistry, and its full discussion might tend to throw light upon the general principles of toleration. A few observations on the subject may therefore not be out of place.

The question is, whether we may rightly punish a man for not obtaining medical help for his children. If the patient himself declined assistance, we might be disposed to give a very short answer. It would certainly be a piece of tyranny, or so we should say at first sight, to force a man to take medicine if he did not believe in its efficacy. Indeed it is almost an open question whether he would not be generally right. It is a delicate problem whether the health of the world would be improved or deteriorated by the extermination of all doctors. It is certain that in the last century Government would have enforced remedies, such as excessive bleeding, which we should now hold to be directly injurious; and it is not impossible that our descendants may think that the popularity of some remedies now popular is also an illustration of our ignorance. Indeed the question would at once occur, whether we should administer homœopathic globules or the orthodox medicines, and such a discussion would very soon become as bitter as any that rages over State interference in religious matters. In order to enforce any practice by forcible measures, it is clearly necessary that something like certainty should have been obtained in regard to the principles upon which it is founded. It is more generally admitted that we have no infallible authority in medicine than that we have no such authority in religion. Why then not tolerate a medical secularism, if we may use the expression, as freely as we tolerate Mr. Bradlaugh? Why force people to take pills any more than we force them to go to church? And if this be admitted, as will probably be the case, does it not also follow that we should allow people to treat their children according to that medical system which they prefer? Is there any matter in which the sense of parental responsibility should be more anxiously maintained than the care of their children's bodily health, unless, indeed, it be the care of their spiritual health? If we should allow a man—and it is generally agreed that we have, in point of fact, no other choice—to bring up his children without a belief in God or a future life, to say nothing of any more special form of creed, why should we not allow him to bring them up without the pills or potions of any recognized sect of physicians?

To this it will be answered that there are some matters which must evidently come under the control of the State, and cannot be removed from it by a simple allegation that they are inextricably associated with religious principle. There is, for example, the generally quoted case of the Thugs; the State must put down murder, whether it is or is not regarded as acceptable to the deities

of the criminal. The same principle would of course justify us in enforcing necessary regulations for the restraint of infectious diseases. A man has no more right to give his neighbour the smallpox than to put a rope round his throat; and we must in each case adopt such measures of prevention as experience proves to be effective. If we are compelled, in so doing, to assume the truth of certain medical theories, it is not that we wish to enforce any theory by law, but that we are taking the only means open to us of securing a strictly legitimate end. Nothing can be more distinctly within the proper sphere of legislation than to say that a man shall not wantonly spread disease; and the medical rule is enforced merely by way of inseparable corollary, and not as our principal motive. Putting aside, however, this consideration, the case is rather different when we confine ourselves entirely to the children. It is plain, indeed, that there are some rules which we must enforce unless we intend to make the paternal authority equivalent to the severest form of slavery. A father must be bound to feed and clothe his children, because otherwise we give him leave to starve them to death whenever he likes. If he should lock up a child without food for a fortnight, he would be properly treated as a deliberate murderer, even though he had brought Scripture to justify an absolute confidence on his part that ravens would bring them bread and meat. There are, however, actions in regard to which it is not easy to draw the line, or even to discover the guiding principle. A gentleman started the theory not long ago that children ought to wear no clothes for the first years of their lives. He put it in practice in regard to his own sons; and, if we remember rightly, he describes his boy as running about in the snow stark naked at the age of ten, and rather enjoying it than otherwise. According to the theory of the father—and probably it rested on as sound a foundation as a good many other medical theories—the constitution of civilized mankind has been seriously weakened by an effeminate indulgence in clothes; and if his boy had died from diseases brought on, in the opinion of jealous physicians, by exposure, his parent would of course have considered it to be a vexatious but accidental coincidence. Would it then have been proper to convict the father of manslaughter, and punish him for trying on his own flesh and blood an experiment which, if successful, would certainly possess a high medical interest? If we say that the father should be excused in consideration of his good intentions, whilst everybody would admit that a father who did precisely the same thing out of avarice or malice should be severely punished, we introduce a fatal element of uncertainty. Anybody would be enabled to indulge in any atrocity towards his children by inventing a theory for the occasion. The tutor who beat his pupil to death out of pure desire for his spiritual welfare would escape scot-free; and it would soon be discovered that every ruffian who kicked his wife into a jelly was merely adopting some new method of sanitary treatment.

The simple truth is that in such cases as these it is impossible to lay down any infallible rule. We are compelled, however reluctantly, to choose between making a few martyrs and allowing a great many innocent people to be made victims. It is unpleasant to punish a man for conduct towards his own children which, as we see no reason to doubt, is dictated by a genuine religious conviction and by real affection, though undoubtedly perverted by crass stupidity. But then it is impossible to leave such a man unpunished and to punish others who act in the same way out of sheer brutality. Having no mode of testing the state of mind which leads to an overt action, we must sometimes confound the fanatic with the ruffian; and it is perhaps possible that we may sometimes confound them both with men who are really in advance of their age. Some comfort indeed may be derived from two or three reflections. In the first place, these delicate questions very rarely occur in practice; secondly, there can be no reasonable doubt that the immense majority of the sufferers are simply a set of stupid bigots—which, it is true, is no excuse for treating them unjustly, but is still some comfort so far as the practical effect of the interference is concerned; and, thirdly, persecution is in our days of that moderate type which is more likely to give fresh energy to any genuine sparkle of belief than to extinguish it. We cannot suppose that the Peculiar People are destined to be the regenerators of the universe; indeed we have a strong suspicion that they are a very poor and humble little sect, and likely to disappear altogether at a moment's notice. So far, however, as they have any faith in their tenets, it is not likely to be quenched by the persecutors of the Central Criminal Court. And if only for this reason we may perhaps venture to express a hope that they will not have very severe sufferings to undergo. After all, what is the worst that is likely to happen if the theory upon which the Peculiar People act turns out to be as groundless as we venture to suppose? There would be a practical experiment as to the value of medical attendance which would be not altogether without its interest; and if that value turned out to be great, the Peculiar People would tend to die out. The human mind, moreover, is so strongly tempted to apply for assistance, even to the lowest variety of quacks, that the medical profession need be in little fear of ultimately becoming obsolete. When the Peculiar People have been punished by a few epidemics, we suspect that their faith will grow weak, and that heresies will spring up. Probably some innovator will discover that, though praying over sick people is essential, religion no more forbids medicine than food. We shall be disposed to rely more for conversion on the profound longing of the British rustic in distress for some kind of doctor's stuff than on any punishment from without. When the

question is raised it is impossible to refuse interference on behalf of the luckless infants who are born in this enthusiastic sect. But the difficulty of forcing people to take medicine when they don't want it is proverbially great; and therefore we should venture to hope that the law will be administered with due consideration. It is as well that they should know that there is some limit to the tricks which may be played with helpless children; but, after all, the crotchet which they have got into their heads is singularly harmless compared with many which claim to be regarded as sacred.

## TRIALS.

THERE are perhaps few words in common use that have such a variety of different, though not divergent, senses as the word "trial." Schoolboys often speak of "the trials," meaning the half-yearly or scholarship examinations, while the cognate verb is probably most familiar to their sisters as applied to trying on a new dress. Any contest of rival forces, from a game of cricket or croquet to the more serious struggles of later life, may be called, according to its demand on the intellectual or physical resources of the combatants, a trial of skill or of strength. The medieval ordeal was an appeal to the judgment of God in the trial by fire, as the legal procedure which has superseded it is called a trial now. An institution which has been newly started, or is threatened with attack or decay, is said to be on its trial—a remark applied some years ago by the late Prince Consort to constitutional government. Then, again, a tried man is a man who has had something of the experience of life, whether generally or in some particular line, and has profited by it; while in such phrases as the trials of life, or a great trial, we usually understand the word in a sense almost synonymous with afflictions. The latter sense seems to predominate, though without excluding the idea of probation also, in the use made of the word by the English translators of the New Testament; or at least it is the sense which would most naturally suggest itself to an English reader unacquainted with the original, where the different Greek words rendered by "trial" point to the etymological rather than the derivative sense. And it is in this strict sense of testing or proving, "as silver is tried in the furnace," that the verb, both active and passive, is ordinarily used in both the Old and New Testament. In modern parlance the active voice conveys the notion of enterprise, and the passive of suffering. A man tries to do his best, and he is tried by a severe illness or the death of a friend; while, again, a very trying occasion suggests the double idea of suffering and undergoing a test. It is obvious at once that all these various uses of the word, however widely some of them may appear to differ, have a common origin and scope. They are all reducible to two, not at first sight necessarily connected, but which the immemorial use of language proves to have a very close interdependence on each other in the common experience of mankind, and thus in fact are ultimately resolved into the one strict and original sense of the word. A trial simply means, as its equivalents in other languages mean, a testing or proving; and it is because tests are so various in their kinds and their consequences that it has come to embrace such a variety of distinct applications. But it may be interesting to examine the connexion of thought a little more closely.

The original sense, then, of the word trial is that of probation, or applying a test. It is in this way that a competitive examination comes to be called a trial; or any contest, from a game of cricket to a war between two great nations, a trial of strength. And thus individuals or governments or institutions are put on their trial when we are taking stock of them, so to speak, to see what is in them and what they are worth. A trial in a law court is a testing or sifting at once of the prisoner who is being tried and of the evidence alleged against him, as the old method of decision by single combat or burning ploughshares was supposed to test his innocence by the infallible criterion of a divine judgment expressed in his endurance or failure under the ordeal. All this is clear enough as soon as it is stated. But it may not seem equally obvious to everybody that when we say, for instance, that the loss of a passenger ship at sea is a most heavy trial to the near relatives of those on board, we are using the word in the same, or at least in a strictly cognate, sense. We referred just now to the language of the English version of the New Testament; and this may help to illustrate the perplexity and its solution. It is said in a well-known passage that God will not suffer men to be tempted above what they are able to bear, and this is usually explained to mean that they will always be enabled by divine assistance to conquer any temptations to sin, however powerful, although the temptation will be a real probation of their fidelity. But suppose, instead of "tempted," our translators had rendered "tried"; scholars and theologians might have given the same explanation, but the general public would certainly have understood that they were not to have more suffering inflicted on them than they could reasonably be expected to endure. Yet the very same Greek words which are here translated by "tempted" and "temptation" are elsewhere translated "trial" and "tried," the difference of rendering being evidently suggested by the context. A temptation, in the religious sense of the word, may in fact just as correctly be called a trial as the loss of a husband or a son, and for the same reason—it applies a touchstone to the character, and serves to discriminate and exhibit its moral strength. It is perfectly true that in many, perhaps most, cases the original

sense of the word is almost or altogether lost sight of, and that in talking of a severe domestic trial we are thinking simply of a great affliction. But how came the word to acquire this connotation? Surely because all trying, or proving, or "tempting"—to revert to the Scriptural term—implies something painful, and, on the other hand, all suffering has also the nature of a trial. It is so common an observation as almost to have passed into a proverb, that the trials of life leave men very different from what they were before, which is another way of saying that their characters are influenced, whether for better or worse, by the sufferings they have undergone. Here, however, one or two questions naturally present themselves. It may be objected that every event or action of life, pleasurable or painful, leaves its mark on the character, as well as what are called its "trials"; and, again, it may be asked whether by speaking of suffering as trying men's character, we mean that it moulds, or only that it reveals their true nature, and whether we mean to imply that its influence, if it has any, is beneficial.

As to the first point, it is of course a truism to say that character is tested and acted upon by every action and circumstance of daily life, great or small. We are "the creatures of habit," because habits are formed by acts, and when formed react on our conduct and ways of thinking. In this sense a man is always on his trial, and is never in precisely the same moral condition when he goes to bed that he was in when he got up in the morning. Every day has its trials, whether they are trials in the popular sense of the word or not. But it is not therefore unreasonable to connect the term especially with those great crises of life which bring out what is in a man more rapidly and more completely than months or years of an ordinary routine existence. Marie-Antoinette's hair turned white in one night through excess of suffering, and the bodily change is but an outward sign of the inward action on the mind. A sudden access of prosperity may act as quickly and as strongly on the mind as a great sorrow. But the hero of *Ten Thousand a Year* is not often to be met with in real life, and as great afflictions are far more common than great successes or wonderful luck, we have naturally come to associate the former rather than the latter with the idea of searching tests of character. It is a fact, broadly speaking, that the great sorrows of life are also the great trials of life, and hence both ideas have come to be expressed by a common term. The second question has already been in some degree answered by implication. Strictly speaking, of course, to try is to test, and not to mould, character. It is a process analogous to "proving" cannon. But then there is just this difference between things and persons—that moral agents cannot be tested without their character being at the same time influenced, and very decisively influenced, by the process. Even a school examination, to go back to our old example, does not simply ascertain a boy's mental calibre, but very materially affects it, if he takes any pains about the matter at all. And much more is this true of the trials of his after life. It is often said that some men "come out" under great trials, and show a depth and power we had never before credited them with; and no doubt in such cases there must have been good stuff in them, as the phrase goes, or they would not have borne the test when it came; but still the result is something more than a revelation. The trial was needed to bring out, as well as to exhibit, their latent energy, at least as much as the action of fire is needed to bring to the surface the letters written in sympathetic ink. There is a natural inertness about the great majority of men, which requires the application of some powerful external stimulant not only to exhibit but to develop and bring into play the capabilities that are in them, and trials are the touchstone and stimulants of character, as necessity is the mother of invention.

The third question does not admit of so simple a solution. All trial involves discrimination, and to discriminate is to separate the base coin from the good. If there are men whose merits shine out under adversity with a lustre we had never suspected, there are others whose demerits are for the first time brought to light when they are tried without being purified. A sudden and severe demand develops as well as exhibits latent forces, but it cannot create what had no previous existence. It is a principle of Christianity that suffering is a means of sanctification, but then everything depends on the nature and attitude of the mind to which the test is applied. A soldier's life is a hard one, but the army is not usually considered a school of saints. Perhaps we cannot be far wrong in saying that, as a rule, trials make good men better, and bad men worse. Persons who have no depth of character, who, as Dr. Johnson used to express it, have no bottom, succumb; the tinsel is rubbed off, and their innate shallowness and worthlessness becomes manifest both to themselves and others, and gets more hopelessly ingrained into them by the very fact of its manifestation. But then, on the other hand, experience goes to prove that lofty moral altitudes are seldom, if ever, reached without trial. It is a common remark that children are never considerate, and are therefore deficient in the kindness which, unlike mere good nature, implies consideration for the feelings of others; and certainly the exceptions are comparatively rare. But the same may be said of grown-up people who have led an easy, unchequered sort of existence, and have had little experience of the ups and downs and sufferings of life. It is only those who are not unacquainted with trial themselves who can truly say, *miseris succurrere disco*. And that is precisely because endurance of trials, if they are patiently and bravely endured, not only braces the moral nerves, so to speak, but adds a depth and tenderness to the whole character. Coarse natures, unless they are hardened by

suffering, are sure to be softened by it, and refined natures gain in strength and power of active sympathy without losing anything of their refinement. There are some trials which directly tend to embitter a man's feelings against his fellows, and so to produce a hard and cynical temper; but even these will be turned to account for an opposite purpose by the nobler natures, though the effort is at first a hard one. The *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius supply an illustration of this, as it would be called under different circumstances, Christian use of suffering, though there is in his case a dash of Stoic hardness about it. But this is a point in which it may fairly be said that Christian society has made a distinct advance both on the moral standard and the actual practice of former ages. There is a "tender grace" about the private virtues as well as the art, the literature, and the poetry of the modern world, which is all but wholly wanting in classical antiquity. And the added dignity and appreciation of suffering, which is indicated by the very use of the word "trial" most familiar to our ears, is one chief reason of the difference. Under the old Pagan civilizations, pain, in all its forms of bodily or mental suffering, was an object either of contempt or dread. It offended the fastidious delicacy of Hellenic taste, and could only appear despicable to those who expressed strength and virtue by a common term. But in proportion as the providential office of trials is recognised as no mere penalty to be endured as best it may be, but as at once a test to discriminate the genuine ore from the dross, and a discipline to evoke and perfect nobleness of character, will be their beneficial effect. If to be a tried man is to be a man who may be trusted and looked up to, then to have borne trials, and borne them well, is not only to have established a fresh claim on general sympathy and respect, but to have acquired an additional power of goodness and a larger heart.

#### THE MEANNESSES OF RESPECTABILITY.

FOREIGNERS are usually much impressed by the announcements which appear in large type at the end of the leading articles in the *Times*, stating that A. B. or C. D. has sent a remittance to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in payment of arrears of Income-tax. As far as we are aware, there is no other country in which anything of the kind has ever been known to happen. It is the practice in the United States to publish the list of assessments, and occasionally rivals in trade or deacons in the same chapel denounce each other for defrauding the public by an under-estimate of income; but it does not appear that Americans are in the habit of denouncing themselves, even under initials or a *nom de plume*, and remitting the balance due to the Treasury. In most countries the Government is regarded as a body which is quite capable of taking care of itself, and if in a trial of wits and smartness the Government should get the worst of it, the clever person who has cheated it is thought to have fairly earned the advantage. We are afraid that the delicacy of conscience which is shown by some of our fellow-citizens does not always win unqualified respect from foreigners. It is regarded as absurdly Quixotic, and indeed rather invidious to the Government, which is thus made to look like a stupid sportsman who is always missing his aim, so that at last the hares and pheasants take pity on him, and offer themselves as voluntary tribute to his bag. Assuming that the relations between the Government and the taxpayers are similar to those between a sportsman and his game, there is perhaps something to be said for this view of the matter. On the other hand, it may be observed that there is a curious perplexity among ourselves as to how the question should be regarded. Sometimes the anonymous people who send Income-tax to the Chancellor of the Exchequer are laughed at as fools, while at other times they are extolled as a proof of the fine morality and sensitive conscience of the nation. As a rule perhaps laughter predominates. It has probably not escaped observation that the sums thus remitted are comparatively small, although there is reason to suppose that considerable amounts are withheld from the Treasury by means of fraudulent returns or other means of evasion. Not long ago a comparison of the returns of Income-tax in a particular district with the amount of compensation demanded for certain demolitions in the same quarter, and supposed to be also based upon calculations of income, disclosed some startling discrepancies. It is apparently not an unfair inference that when the people who have begun by cheating the Chancellor of the Exchequer take it into their heads to make their peace with conscience, they try to do so on the easiest terms; if it is a very costly operation they let it alone, but a modest outlay on this account is regarded as not a bad investment. On the whole, we are disposed to think that these remittances are, as far as they go, a healthy sign. Even a sluggish conscience is better than none at all, and although the restitutions may not amount to a large sum at the end of each year, they are continually being made, and would seem to indicate a sound appreciation of the relations between the Government and the people. There can be no doubt that a great many persons contrive to evade the full payment of their taxes; but it is at least satisfactory to observe from these sporadic symptoms that there is a certain degree of sensitiveness as to the obligations of citizenship.

Some of these days we shall perhaps find people sending remittances to the secretaries of the Railway Companies, just as they now do to the Treasury. Scarcely a week passes without somebody—usually a respectable middle-class man, solicitor, clerk, or

trader, or something of that kind—being pulled up at the police-court for swindling a Railway Company by riding in a first-class carriage with a second or third-class ticket, by pretending to have a season ticket when he has none, and so on. Every now and then the Companies begin to look after the matter very sharply, and it is then discovered that a large body of people, not poor rogues and sharpers, but highly respectable well-to-do folk, are in the habit of systematically and constantly evading the payment of the proper fares. Anybody who travels much by any of the metropolitan lines must have had many opportunities of witnessing examples of this loose morality. These people would be shocked and horrified at the idea of stealing anything from a shop, and are no doubt most edifying in the severe morality with which they condemn the offence of a cook who has helped her sweetheart out of the pantry, or of a shopboy who has made free with the till. Yet there is of course just as much dishonesty in riding first-class with a third-class ticket as in appropriating anything else which does not belong to one. The attempt to ride on a railway without paying any fare at all is a more naked and unequivocal kind of theft; yet it appears from some recent cases that there are people, who certainly cannot plead poverty or necessity in extenuation of their offence, who not only stoop to this roguery for the sake of the most paltry sums, but who even resort to elaborate shifts and stratagems to accomplish their purpose. Stolen fruit is proverbially the sweetest, and we are bound to suppose that there is something peculiarly exquisite and luxurious in cheating a Railway Company out of a ride. The unpopularity of the Companies has perhaps something to do with it. It may be argued that, as they take so much out of the public, the public is entitled to take its revenge when it has a chance, without much regard to the morality of the transaction. This was the sort of excuse which used to be made for smuggling in former days. Apart altogether from its cheapness, whisky which had been distilled over a peat fire in a cleft of the rocks was supposed to have a better flavour than any which had been lawfully manufactured under the eyes of the Excise. Even now, when smuggling and illicit distillation have been practically put down by the reduction of duties, there are people who like to fancy that they are tipping contraband spirits, and who would be sadly disappointed to find that their liquor had had a perfectly innocent and lawful origin. No doubt railway managers behave very badly in many ways; but respectable people who do not like hard words should remember that robbery is robbery, whether practised on Railway Companies or on anybody else. There is evidently a strong affinity to kleptomania in this habit of cheating the Companies out of their fares. If we could analyse the state of mind of the offenders, we should probably discover that they were prompted by an odd combination of motives, such as a vague notion that the Railways represent a kind of Ishmael who deserves no pity, a morbid passion for small economies, an idea that the smallness of the sum takes the fraud out of the category of serious offences, and a chuckling sense of superior cleverness in evading payment. There can be no doubt that this is a species of dishonesty which the Companies are bound, not only in their own interest, but in the interest of the public, to expose and bring to punishment. One or two severe examples will perhaps have a good effect, and the appearance of respectable offenders of this class before a police magistrate in the place usually occupied by pickpockets and housebreakers will help to attach a social stigma to an act which is at present apt to be regarded too much as a mere freak or foolish eccentricity.

Everybody, it has been remarked, has a pet virtue or a pet vice, and it may almost more truly be said that everybody has a pet meanness. The meannesses of respectability are of all kinds and degrees. They vary of course with different people. Some can never settle with a cabman without a desperate struggle over the odd sixpence, and a rankling sense of injury and ruin if the obstinate Jehu happens to get the better of them; others are dismayed if they are unexpectedly caught at church when the offertory bags are sent round. With others, again, the weak point is perhaps stationery, or some other cheap article for household use; they can never bring themselves to make a bold investment of a few shillings' worth at a time, but go on from hand to mouth with petty purchases which may have an economical appearance in detail, although they are pretty sure to prove more extravagant in the long run than a larger order. There are even rumours that a raid upon club paper is not absolutely unknown. We wonder how many people ever think of buying a few new pens. There seems to be a superstitious notion among a large class that pens never wear out; they must be handed down in families almost as if they were articles of great cost and rarity. Blotting-paper, too, is apt to be cherished as an object of extravagant luxury, over which persons of moderate means are bound to be very careful. People who think nothing of going to considerable expense for a dinner or a trip to the country will go on for months painfully economizing with a few wretched blackened leaves rather than spend sixpence on a fresh supply. The old system of franking letters produced a characteristic development of meanness. The shifts and contrivances to which people used to resort to procure a frank; the labour, and sometimes even, as it would appear, the expense, to which they put themselves to get at some one who had it in his power to confer the coveted favour; the intrigues, entreaties, supplications to which they stooped, are almost incredible. It is only fair, of course, to remember that

the rates of postage were enormously high as compared with the rates of the present day, and also that eighteen-pence or a couple of shillings was then a relatively larger sum than now. Yet, after making every allowance on this account, it is amazing that persons who were not in pinched circumstances should have thought it worth while to hunt after a frank, valued at perhaps two shillings or thereabouts, with such keenness and unblushing mendicancy. It was a fashionable meanness, and everybody practised it. It is amusing to note in the letters and diaries of the last generation how the getting of a frank, or a fruitless pursuit of one, was deemed quite important enough to be recorded, and how frequently the incident turns up. The parallel to this morbid passion in our own day is perhaps the mania for orders for the play. M. Taine has remarked with some astonishment in his recent letters that amusements of this kind form a small item in the expenses of an English middle-class family, and that it is thought a necessary economy to go to the theatre only when free passes can be procured. Managers, actors, dramatic critics, newspaper editors, whose pockets are supposed to be stupefied with orders, are importuned recklessly and shamelessly, in order that well-to-do people may be provided gratuitously with what they could themselves purchase for a few shillings whenever they chose. During a discussion of the subject a year or two since, it was stated that managers and actors frequently receive letters from persons who are entire strangers to them, expressing a desire to witness their performances, and begging for orders. Perhaps the lowest depth of meanness to which respectability descends is in seeking medical attendance at the hospitals, thus abusing the charity of these institutions and defrauding the poor, whose places they occupy. At a recent Poor Law Conference it was asserted that cases were known in which respectable householders had disguised themselves as servants in order to procure gratuitous advice and medicine; and, even without disguise, people in comfortable circumstances not unfrequently avail themselves of the hospitals rather than call in a doctor to attend them. This, however, is not merely a meanness, but an act of dishonesty, and it is a pity there is no means of punishing it as it deserves. Reasonable economy is always respectable in small things as in great; but the meannesses of which we have been speaking are at the best but bastard economies, and serve not unfrequently as an excuse for extravagance in other ways. Wasteful people often have fits of petty parsimony, and will squander a pound with great equanimity on the strength of the supposed virtue and self-denial which has been exercised in some shabby trick for saving sixpence.

#### PEEPS AT SPIRITS.

THERE can be no doubt that Spiritualism, or Spiritism, for we decline entering on a question about which "eminent lexicographers," as the *Medium News* tells us, are at variance, is really marching on. It is rapidly freeing itself from the base elements of table-turning, rapping, "tipping," and planchette writing, and attaining a far more direct faculty of converse with the ghostly world. It is true that some of the lowlier incidents of its early origin still cling to it; that, with a few exceptions, its *séances*, so far as London is concerned, seem to be held in queer quarters—in London Fields, Clerkenwell, or Bethnal Green—and that its mediums still rejoice in the oddest of all possible names. Since the heroes of Mr. Dickens's later fictions, we have met with no odder group of designations than those enjoyed by Messrs. Guppy, Mumler, Shorter, Cogman, and Simkiss. But it must be owned that greater names are dropping in. "The People's Poet" and "the Discoverer of Thallium," titles which certainly throw halo of grandeur round the rather commonplace personages of Mr. Crookes and Mr. Gerald Massey, are at the head of the movement. It has been formally announced by the spirits themselves that all criticism on their doings and sayings is simply the result of "weak blood and a strumous temperament." The movement is widening its borders beyond Clerkenwell and Bethnal Green; there is a "respectable church" of Spiritualists at Melbourne, in which we are glad to remark the new peculiarity of "a marked predominance of intellectual physiognomy," and there is a circle at Cairo where "Madame Blawatsky" is willing for a consideration to reproduce the plague of frogs or any similar incident of Pharaonic life at a moment's notice. Spiritualism has at last a worship, which is described as consisting of "invocations, the singing of suitable hymns, and the delivery of addresses without any ceremony or ritual." To conduct worship without ceremony or ritual of any sort is an achievement which even Quakers despair of, and of which Spiritualism may be justly proud; though we are bound to say that the accounts of such services as we have seen have the familiar twang of the conventicle, and little besides to recommend them. The address of the "Medium in a Trance," which closes the proceedings, reads wonderfully like the ordinary discourse of our friend Mr. Stiggins out of it. But this is of little consequence when, as the Spiritualist organ triumphantly observes, "Science is on our side, and the spirit of the age is with us." It is of still less importance when the spirits themselves, after a good deal of ghostly coquetry, have been at last wheedled into coming fairly to the front, when these ghostly visitants are no more like Wordsworth's cuckoo, "a wandering voice," but are good enough to take material form, and to allow themselves to be seen of mortal eyes and photographed in common cartes-de-visite.

The first photographic manifestation took place, of course, in America, but the Yankee seer experienced the usual prophetic fate, and the discovery had to be made over again in less sceptical climes. It is only fair to Mr. Samuel Guppy that he should tell his own story. He had accompanied his wife with conjugal solicitude to a photographic studio, and "after the sitting was finished I asked her to try an experiment to see if I could get a spirit photograph. I arranged the drapery, sitting myself in front of a screen of black cloth, my wife being behind it. While so sitting, waiting for Mr. Hudson to bring the prepared plate, a wreath of artificial flowers was placed on my head. Mr. Hudson brought the plate, took and developed the picture, which showed a draped figure in white standing behind me." We see the result in a copy of the *carte-de-visite* which is now before us. The world knows nothing of its greatest men, and we were a little startled at first sight of the venerable person with whom spirits take such affectionate liberties. If we may trust the photograph, Mr. Guppy is a rather short and podgy person, with an extremely ill-fitting coat, and leaning back in a chair with that air of attempted serenity which is common in photographic studios. His head appears to be bald, and is certainly covered by a wreath of flowers, which, as big cabbage-roses of this sort hardly bloom in the month of March, we may presume to be artificial. Behind Mr. Guppy is a white erection, which might be a spirit, and which might be a pump, but which to mortal eyes would rather suggest a couple of broomsticks draped in a white sheet. Altogether, let us frankly own, this first spiritual photograph is a little destructive of reverence. The mind instinctively quits the veiled broomsticks to fasten itself on Mr. Guppy, and that comfortable face, the face of a cozy tallow-chandler, when crowned with paper roses becomes absolutely irresistible. We should tremble for the domestic happiness of Mrs. Guppy if Mrs. Guppy had not claimed her share in these spiritual interviews. "I will go with Tommy," said Mrs. Guppy in words which throw a certain subdued light on the inner life of the Guppy circle, "I will go with Tommy to get a spirit photograph, but I must have my own way entirely. I am always interfered with, and told to do this or that, but this time I will have my own way!" The result of this spirited conduct shall be told in her husband's words:—"We went at three o'clock to Mr. Hudson's. A snow-storm came on. However, she placed herself kneeling with the child in front. She desired me to look at her through the cloth screen all the while. . . . Though I say it as shouldn't say it, I think it is the most beautiful photograph I have ever seen, and worthy of copying by a first-rate painter." We may fairly pardon this little outburst of Mr. Guppy's artistic enthusiasm, as we have pardoned his little irrelevance about the snow and the exquisite "however" which follows it, but to ordinary eyes the photograph is a very inferior photograph indeed. Our natural curiosity about the spirited wife who "will have her own way" is disappointed by so terribly blurred a face that not a feature can be made out. Such as she is, however, Mrs. Guppy kneels in the foreground, holding "Tommy," whose hair does not appear to have seen a brush for some months, in her arms, while a very unmistakable spirit towers high behind them. Unluckily the countenance of "the spirit Katey"—for Mr. Guppy is good enough to supply us with her name—is less distinct than Mrs. Guppy's own. She is got up in the usual stage ghost fashion—indeed, we think it reflects credit on our dramatic managers that they should for so many years have known how a ghost would be clothed when it was actually good enough to appear on earth. A fillet is tied over the brow, and a loose white drapery is thrown loosely and vaguely over the rest of the figure, leaving a little hole for the face and two smaller apertures for a couple of ghostly hands. It is a little trying to faith to remark how easily the whole thing could be imitated with a common white pocket-handkerchief and an ordinary sheet. We have not had the privilege of seeing any spiritual representations in which the ghostly sitter appeared in a more distinctive garb, though we are led to hope that such may soon be vouchsafed. Mr. John Jones has indeed succeeded in inducing spirits to appear in a more earthly guise. In the photograph of his daughters "one of the spirits has on a dark shawl, is stooping, and reading a book; the other standing and thinking." Of course, when one can photograph a spirit, it is easy to photograph thought into the bargain. But the greatest success was achieved in a second attempt, where "a spirit seems to have come in with bonnet and lace fall on, as if a visitor, to see the group of three taken by the camera." It may have been a little jealousy of the "lace fall" which induced "the spirit Katey" to dispense, after Mr. Guppy's interviews, with photographs altogether. Mr. Smith gives us an account before which that of Mr. Jones fades into insignificance. At the séance which he describes, "Katey came over to the side where Mr. Harrison and myself were sitting, and showed two brilliant lights, one in each hand, the fingers of which could be seen as though grasping the light. She said to Mr. H., 'Now, Willie, can you see me?' and as she spoke she turned the light upon her countenance, which could be seen distinctly, the taper moving as she spoke. He then illuminated part of her dress, which she said was such as she wore in India, referring to me at the time for confirmation. 'Now can you understand? This is the way we show ourselves in the photographs.' Mr. H. requested and was permitted to touch the figure which we saw." Katey only disappeared to make way for a dear friend, every feature of whose face was distinctly to be recognized. "Yes, Cliff," said the spirit—Mr. Smith's name, we may remark, is

"Clifford," but spirits have their little familiarities—"you recognize me, you recognize me!"

After manifestations of this kind, we must own that the more ordinary spiritual demonstrations pull a little on our taste. We don't think we can be rallied into vivid interest, even when the spirits ram our strong-minded friend Mrs. Guppy headlong through the stout brick wall of her bed-room, and leave her in a light and airy déshabille to be picked up by the policeman or other kind friends on the pavement. A flower-pot, it is pathetically added, accompanied her in her flight and stood uninjured beside her. We doubt whether our curiosity will be greatly raised even should Miss Lottie Fowler be transported a second time out of an omnibus without notice (or, we fear, payment) to the conductor, and brought into a *séance* through the keyhole, although it may be interesting to know that "the conductor has been sought for, but not as yet discovered." Mr. "Punch" will, no doubt, learn with interest that "the liqueur-bottle with silver top and stopper," which mysteriously disappeared at a *séance* which he was good enough to comment upon, has returned in answer to his remonstrances. It fell suddenly from the ceiling in the presence of the two mediums who assisted at its disappearance, and to whose honesty the "silver top and stopper" bear convincing witness, though by an accident nothing is said about the liqueur. After all liqueur-bottles are only liqueur-bottles and spirits are spirits. The appearance of "Katey" in her Indian shawl, and of Mr. Jones's anonymous friend in her "lace fall," puts all other wonders out of court. We cannot help, however, feeling a certain anxiety as to the ultimate issue of these spiritual appearances. When the spirit of "John King" flings sofa cushions about the room and puts his medium, Mr. Williams, through the roof as a punishment of disobedience, we see that we have some spiritual rough customers to deal with. And our comfort is by no means increased when we are introduced to Mr. "Jack Todd," a Liverpool spirit who amuses himself with tearing a table to pieces and flinging the legs of it at the heads of his visitors. As he turns out to be the spirit of a highwayman, we are hardly consoled by the assurance that "he will no doubt improve in time." But if Mr. King is to appear in person for the purpose of hurling us through the roof, and Mr. Todd in visible shape is to reappear with his highwayman's pistols, it is clear we shall be driven to ask for the institution of a Spiritual police. There is no need, however, to anticipate dangers, and meanwhile these visible apparitions afford a timely check to the merely "sensual" critics who, out of sheer "weak blood and strumous temperament," are for ever insisting on the test of utility. As to utility, we have Mr. Sharp's confession that "the Sharp rifle was wholly invented for him by the spirits, and that he merely obeyed their injunctions." Detectives, too, would become at once unnecessary if our present criminal code were only reformed. "Tracing murders and other criminal occurrences is quite practicable, and will be common to mediums whenever society is enlightened enough to make a proper use of the information thus obtained. All clairvoyants and mediums, with hardly an exception, decline to give information in such cases because of the very unpleasant moral relations that it subjects them to." The spirit world will have nothing to do with our present system of criminal punishment, or it would not be honoured with the patronage of Mr. Jack Todd. But, setting aside all merely practical results, we may clearly expect some remarkable changes in the spiritual conduct should spirits be good enough to come face to face with us. The sentimental tone which unhappily pervades all the communications we have ever seen from the spirit world will no doubt pass into a tone more common among persons of average intelligence. "Ellen," for instance, when consulted about the health of a living friend, will hardly reply in a rhapsody of this sort:—"Ellen sees her friend's wasting form is nearly extinct. She may reach the first cheerful warbling of the birds, which invite her to the bright shores of that ever-blissful land of happy angels, who are standing to aid her to ascend those beautiful regions of ever-reigning harmony, where the angels of bliss are singing their welcome chants of melody ringing through the groves of the most luxuriant plants and trees, whose fragrance perfumes the air. As you glide through, scarcely touching the soil, you feel to soar the air like the things of winged creation; but pride does not exist among the dear angel spirits." If "Ellen" would only allow some less intimate friend to suggest that a "form" can be hardly "extinct," and that "ascending a region" is almost as difficult as "soaring the air." It is, perhaps, hardly safe to entertain the more ambitious hope that an Ecumenical Council of visible spirits might settle some of the difficulties which seem to exist in the Spiritual Church itself. There is a schism on the subject of vaccination; there is another schism on the subject of Christianity. Mr. Jones still seems to cling to the Christian tradition, while the freer Spiritualists call up the spirit of Tom Paine, and declare "there are vast asylums in the spirit world where the victims of dogma are placed until they are able to perceive truth independently." There is a schism as to "psychic force," where the followers of Mr. Hume find no words too emphatic for Mr. Serjeant Cox. Unhappily the spirits seem as divided as their followers. Those who look for theologic peace in the after world have still to learn that Unitarian and Trinitarian spirits carry on their dogmatical controversies as busily as if they were on earth, though, as it seems to the "strumous" critic, with even less intelligence of the subject discussed. But if we cannot get a council, we can at least get a photograph, and spirits that can find no

union in theology can find a common ground of enjoyment in crowning Mr. Guppy with artificial roses, and in gladdening the heart of Mr. Jones with a "lace fall."

## METROPOLITAN SCHOOLS.

THE "Report of the School Board for London to the Education Department," which has recently been issued, enables us to supplement the information we gave in a former article on metropolitan schools (November 4, 1871), in which we speculated upon the probable consequences which would result from the inquiries conducted during the course of last year, and suggested some of the difficulties likely to occur. The Report before us consists of fourteen pages, and is followed by three appendices, containing the census of children, the tabulation of the reports sent by the inspectors of schools and of returns, and the deficiency of school accommodation. It begins by describing the labours of the Board since its first meeting in December 1870. On the 20th of April, 1871, the Board received instructions to report upon the following points:—

1. The number of children within its limits for whom means of elementary education should be provided between the ages of three and five, and between the ages of five and thirteen.
2. The provision to meet the requirements of these children already made by efficient schools, or likely to be made by schools either contemplated or in course of erection.
3. The deficiency (if any) in the supply of efficient elementary education, as shown by comparing 1 and 2.
4. What schools are required to meet this deficiency.
5. The localities in which such schools should be provided.

Of these five points the first alone can be said to be accurately ascertained. The Board, with the help of the Census Office and their own staff of enumerators, after eliminating children who attended or should attend a school not elementary and children in institutions, arrived at the conclusion that the gross number of children between the ages of three and thirteen who were attending elementary schools was 398,679. The number of those who required elementary schools, but did not attend, was 176,014. After deducting the reasonable and necessary causes of absence, it was computed that 80,039 had no excuse for non-attendance, and consequently that the whole number of children for whom elementary schools should be provided was 478,718. With regard to the second point, our readers are aware that the Education Department conducted this branch of the investigation ("the Board having no staff immediately available for the purpose") made inquiries into the efficiency of the public, private, and adventure schools existing or projected in the metropolis, and concluded its labours at the close of last year; 3,275 existing or projected elementary schools had to be taken into account, affording accommodation for 413,233 scholars. Had, therefore, all these schools proved efficient, additional provision would only have been required for some 40,000 scholars. This, however, was far from being the case, and out of these 3,275 schools, 1,876 were condemned, consisting of 74 public, 122 private, and 1,682 adventure schools. With regard to these latter schools, the Report says:—

Under the circumstances of the case, the Board submitted to the Department that it would not be advisable to interpret too literally the requirements of the Department as laid down in the new Code. Some latitude must be allowed, so that if a school could pass in a certain standard in the first instance, time might be given for the attainment of a higher standard. As the Inspectors completed their examination of different districts, their conclusions were communicated to the Board. Some schools were passed both for buildings and instruction, and these are consequently classed with the efficient schools. Others were condemned in both respects, and have, therefore, not been taken into account as providing suitable accommodation. But an intermediate class of schools has been reported to be efficient either in buildings or instruction, but not in both; and with reference to these, the Board have obtained the consent of the Department that a period of grace should be accorded to them. To the managers of all schools in this category a circular has been addressed inviting them within three months to bring their schools up to the necessary standard of efficiency, and undertaking that meantime the accommodation they provide shall provisionally be taken into account.

The consequence of this period of grace, which appears to us a needless complication, is that at the present moment there are two classes of schools recognized; first, the schools reported to be efficient in both building and instruction, amounting in number to 1,149; and, secondly, those efficient in either building or instruction, of which the number is 250. These latter provide accommodation for 37,995 children, and are composed of sixty public, ninety-six private, eighty-one adventure, and thirteen projected schools. Of the adventure schools, thirty-two are reported as efficient in building and forty-nine in instruction only. We have pointed out before the extreme improbability of any change being effected in the constitution of these schools, and therefore these eighty-one may be regarded as condemned. The inquiries made last year were conducted on the assumption that where the buildings were unfit for educational purposes it was useless to enter into the question of instruction; had it been otherwise, a considerable fraction of the 1,682 condemned adventure schools might have been reported as efficient in instruction only. The character of the instruction was virtually a second test, to be applied in those cases where the condition of the premises was satisfactory. It is quite evident, however, in looking over the tabulated returns in the second Appendix of the Report, that different standards have been applied in different districts in the

examination of these schools. In Lambeth alone 89 adventure schools out of 413 have been recognized—that is to say, more than one-half of the whole number of adventure schools pronounced efficient (162) are in one single district out of the ten of which the metropolis is composed. On the other hand, if we turn to Southwark, we find that only seven out of 276 have been recognized, in the Tower Hamlets two out of 297, while in Marylebone only one out of 81 has been passed as efficient, and no dame's school reported as efficient in instruction only. There is no reason to suppose that a lower standard of education is required for Lambeth, nor is the deficiency of school accommodation as great as in the division of the Tower Hamlets, where nearly one-third of the children requiring accommodation are unprovided for. It is clear from this that, had the instructions issued by the Education Department been understood and acted upon in the same manner by all the inspectors, not more than a score of these schools would have been left in existence, and the provisional recognition of 243 out of 1,923 must be ascribed to a relaxation of these instructions, and an unwillingness of disposition on the part of the official employed. The inspection of adventure schools appears to have been a kind of compromise between the School Board and the Education Department, offices which naturally looked upon the condemnation of schools in different lights, as upon the former devolved the duty of making good the deficiencies created by the reports of the latter. The object of the Education Department must have been simply to put an end to education as a means of subsistence for the teachers, and the conditions of efficiency they required were precise enough to leave but little scope for the exercise of individual opinion. At the time the Department issued these instructions they must have been aware that they would disqualify all save a fraction, and we may doubt whether it would not have been better to have ignored these schools altogether, and spared 1,923 teachers the shock which their nerves sustained from a visit on the part of the Government. Had this been done, the grievance would have been universal, and no provisionally recognized teacher could have excited envy. It is of course possible that the 1,876 condemned schools may all be remodelled, and that all those which have received invitations to better themselves may respond to them. But we believe that further investigation will only tend to diminish the amount of accommodation provisionally recognized; some of the proposed enlargements will never be carried into effect, many of the projected schools will remain projected, others will be reconstituted as non-elementary schools, and others fail to attain the standard which they may be required to reach during the course of this year. The results of this inquiry will not, however, make themselves felt for a long time. Did we see any likelihood of the dames being immediately affected by their condemnation, we should recommend them to migrate in a body to Lambeth; but they are still unconscious of their doom. We made an expedition to a street rife with "seminaries" to see whether the Report before us was a common text-book. But no one had seen it. Strange to say, no dame had endeavoured to seduce her neighbours' children by an advertisement stating that, though deficient in offices, her instruction was excellent; or that she herself would spell correctly in the course of three months, and bring herself up to the level of her educational furniture. The dame is probably well aware that her life is not worth the number of years which will elapse before the erection of the new metropolitan schools—an interval long enough in all probability to enable an architect to appear to whom their construction might be entrusted with safety. The chief difference between the condemned and the partially recognized school is that the owner of the former will be left in peace, while that of the latter will, we suppose, again receive visits from enumerators or inspectors. The remarks of the School Board do not tend to increase the value of the statistics upon which they purpose to act; the data which have been arrived at are based upon an allowance of eight superficial feet to each child, concerning which the Report says, "It may be doubted whether this amount is sufficient in any case"—a statement the reverse of assuring.

These two classes of provisionally recognized schools are calculated to afford accommodation for 350,920 children, while the accommodation required is for 478,718. The Board, therefore, after deducting a percentage for temporary causes of absence, has arrived at the conclusion that places must be provided for 103,863, and they ask the Department to authorise the immediate provision of schools for 100,000 children. In five out of the ten divisions accommodation in excess of the deficiency to the extent of 9,790 school places is recommended, owing to the unequal distribution of the schools in existence. Marylebone has a deficiency of 3,140 places, and it is proposed to provide accommodation for 7,900 children. The City of London has an excess of 1,418 places, none of which are available to balance a deficiency of 673 places in one of its subdivisions. Of the remaining five divisions of Finsbury, Hackney, Lambeth, Southwark, and the Tower Hamlets, Hackney, which includes the districts of Bethnal Green, Shoreditch, and Homerton, is relatively to its population the most ill-provided with school accommodation, having only 34,851 existing and projected places for 56,906 children, or a deficiency of more than one-third. In these five divisions where the estimated deficiency is 94,121, the Board recommends the immediate provision of school accommodation for 79,650 children:—

The reasons for this modified proposal may be briefly stated as follows—To provide schools, even for 100,000 children, will be a task which will not

easily be accomplished in eighteen months or two years. During that time the Board will have the opportunity of watching the operation of many causes, the effect of which is at present wholly undetermined. How will the By-laws work? the second, which enforces the attendance of children at school; and the fourth, which exempts them from attendance under certain conditions? Will the Half-time Acts, which at present are almost a dead letter, come into more general operation? To what extent will schools which have been condemned by Her Majesty's Inspectors transfer themselves to the Board, and be made efficient? These and other causes may contribute to reduce the deficiency of school accommodation which now appears to exist. Lastly, there is the growing difficulty of obtaining qualified teachers for elementary schools, the number of which is increasing day by day.

The chief point in the above quotation is that the effect of many causes is wholly undetermined, and we may add will probably remain so, until a certain number of mistakes has been made. The Report asks various questions without much expectation of receiving answers, and we shall venture to imitate their example. Will it be easier to find teachers for schools of from 750 to 1,500 children (the number preferred by the Board) than for communities of a smaller extent? How will the payment of school fees be enforced? What is to be the future system of investigation and examination of private schools? The Report before us seems to imply that the inspection of last year was undertaken by the Education Department because the Board had no staff immediately available for the purpose. It is a matter perfectly immaterial to the public who the officials are who inspect metropolitan schools, but it is important that it should be done as simply as possible, and that the expenses of a dual government should be avoided. It may be that all these matters remain to be decided, like the sites and the sizes and the number of schools which it is proposed to erect; the next Report of the School Board will, we trust, enlighten us upon many points "at present undetermined."

#### A POSITIVIST ORACLE.

**M**R. FREDERIC HARRISON has been good enough to favour us with a copy of a Report on the "New Social Movement" of last autumn, to which his name is attached, and which appears to have been written by him and presented to a body called the "Positivist Society." No information is given as to the constitution of this Society, nor is it stated whether it invited or adopted the Report, or whether it is prepared in any way to act upon it. Probably we should not be far wrong in assuming that the "Positivist Society" is the congregation of Comtists which meets in Bedford Row to listen to sermons from Mr. Congreve and other "directors" of the order; but it will be safer to take the Report as simply an expression of Mr. Harrison's individual opinions, without making the Society responsible for any of his proposals. As the world, we are assured, is about to be made regenerate through Positivism, it is worth while to observe some of the practical aspects of this regeneration, as expounded by an authoritative interpreter. When we are fortunate enough to meet with any of these philosophical gentlemen on their rare visits to the prosaic level of this work-a-day world, it is as well to ascertain from them precisely what it is they want to do; indeed it is only in this way that common people can test their magnificent speculations. Mr. Harrison begins by remarking that the importance of the New Social Movement consists in the fact that it is a social and not a political movement, "one, that is, which appeals to social feelings, and not to political parties." It seems to us that, so far as this antithesis is not meaningless, it is inaccurate. It is notorious that the Movement was hawked about from one political party to another; and its promoters have since issued a standing advertisement that they are ready to range themselves under the banner of any body of politicians who will help them to carry out their programme. In point of fact, however, the distinction which Mr. Harrison would draw between social feelings and political parties, as if they were separate and even antagonistic forces, does not exist. A political party is simply the organized expression of social feeling, and it is only by political action that social wants and aspirations can take effect. A number of men agree to work together, and to sink minor differences, for the sake of attaining certain objects which they regard as of paramount importance—this is a party; and this was precisely the way in which Mr. Scott Russell and his working-men offered to join first the Liberals, and then the Conservatives, and to allow either party to govern the country as it liked, if it would only help them to country houses, sunny gardens, and unadulterated provisions at a nominal cost, these things being, it appeared, all they cared about. "The true nature of public problems," says Mr. Harrison, with the air of a deep philosopher announcing some great discovery, the result of years of patient and painful meditation, "is essentially social"; but this is obviously only another way of saying that the problems which relate to society are of a social character, and reminds one of a famous answer about archidiaconal functions. He might have added with equal truth that, though social questions may not be political, as when they deal with matters which are left to private and voluntary arrangement, yet all political questions are essentially social, inasmuch as their ultimate object is the good of society. The difference between the sort of measures with which Parliament is constantly engaged and the wild schemes of the so-called Socialist reformers is not that the welfare of society is disregarded in the former, but that they aim at doing indirectly, and in such a manner as to allow of as much personal freedom as possible, what the latter are in-

tended to accomplish directly and by means of the compulsory intervention of the State. Nothing can be more shallow than the notion that only direct and local treatment is required for social difficulties. When Mr. Harrison goes on to say that the evils complained of should be met, not by political remedies, as the artisans propose, but by moral remedies, the distinction is more substantial; but we soon come upon political ground again, for the moral remedies are, it seems, to be enforced by an "organized moral power," and voluntary effort is to be stimulated by compulsion.

Mr. Harrison has of course no difficulty in picking out the weak points of Mr. Scott Russell's foolish and fantastic scheme. He ridicules the chimerical idea of planting out great cities "in the clear"; and he remarks sarcastically that self-government in smaller circles is scarcely a gain in the eyes of those to whom mere self-government itself offers no hope. In a proper state of society the functions of Government would, we presume, be exercised by a select body of Positivist Professors. "The Positivist system," Mr. Harrison explains, "presupposes, as a condition of all healthy social life, the formation of an organized social power entirely independent of the State, and therefore in no sense a State Church, charged with the moral control and elevation of persons, families, and institutions, with the task of all higher education, and with the expression of systematic public opinion." When put into plain language, this would seem to mean an *imperium in imperio* of a peculiar kind, for the organized moral force would practically become an independent and irresponsible hierarchy, invested with supreme authority. It will be observed that the pretensions of the Positivists very closely resemble those of the Ultramontanists; and, in fact, Positivism might be not unfairly described as Ultramontanism *minus* Christianity. Positivism, as Comte understood it, was a grand scheme for elevating society in all directions all at once, and it was supposed to be essential that nothing should be done until everything was ready for a simultaneous and universal movement. His disciples are, however, beginning to discover that this is rather too long to wait. As a concession to the weaknesses of humanity, Mr. Harrison is good enough to suggest that, pending the formation of the "organized moral power," and in some degree as a step towards it, Positivism might favour a practical attempt to realize the parts of a Social Programme, "provided it be sufficiently comprehensive, so as never to degenerate into Specialism, and sufficiently inspired with moral aims, so as never to end in a mere political cry." And then he proceeds to offer some suggestions for a practical Social Movement from the Positivist point of view. To begin with, the houses of the working classes both in town and country must be entirely reorganized, so as to satisfy health, the conditions of morality, decency, self-respect, and the convenience of cultivated life. The Positivists, we believe, are not alone in desiring that this result may be brought about; and we have never heard of their being conspicuously active in any practical measures for accomplishing it. Indeed, the sort of people who have done most in this way, who have given their time, money, and close personal attention to it, are the very classes whom Mr. Harrison and his friends are usually engaged in denouncing. The problem is not exactly of the easy kind which can be settled offhand by the *flat* of a glib essayist. It is not enough to provide houses that will satisfy the conditions enumerated by Mr. Harrison; the people for whom the houses are intended must also be qualified to appreciate them, and this is a slow and tedious process. Mr. Harrison thinks it will be necessary to rebuild London, so as to economize space by loftier buildings. This little job is to be accomplished partly by private enterprise or munificence, largely and mainly by local municipal effort, partly as a stimulus and example by the State, in all cases assisted by State inspection, loans of public money, local Acts, &c. &c. It is amusing to observe how at the very first step Mr. Harrison, who affects to despise what he calls political remedies, is obliged to resort to them as the chief agency in carrying out his plans. He looks round and sees that things are not exactly as they should be, and then in his grand way he exclaims, "Let London be rebuilt, let the country towns and villages also be rebuilt"; and when the question arises how this is to be done, his only answer is, "If private persons will not do it, then let the State and the Local Boards see to it." We must say that this sort of advice does not strike us as particularly brilliant or helpful. How the State and Local Boards are to be got to work without appeals to political parties and the usual course of political controversy and agitation, Mr. Harrison naturally does not condescend to explain.

One of the essential conditions of the reorganization on which Mr. Harrison insists is not only that houses shall everywhere be rebuilt, but that they shall be made the absolute property of the people who live in them. It is true that he limits this demand to the "workman in town or country." "The workman," we are informed, "can never be a free man or a full citizen until his home is his own—a castle really sacred from private or public oppression." But if this is true of the working class, it would seem to apply equally to a considerable part at least of the middle classes; and we are driven to the conclusion that England has hitherto known very few free men or full citizens. We are afraid the citizen will never have a castle really sacred from private and public oppression unless the possession of his house in absolute freehold is supplemented by some similar kind of protection against the Water Company, which might cut off his water; against the baker, butcher, and grocer, who might withhold supplies unless their tyrannical demands for regular payment were complied with; and against employers, who might take it into their heads to dismiss a workman if he did not give satisfaction,

or if they happened not to have work for him to do. This part of Mr. Garrison's scheme evidently requires a little more elaboration. It might perhaps be suggested that the convenience of the workman himself is promoted by the system of leases and rents, inasmuch as he may have to move from one part of the country, or one part of a town, to another, and cannot carry a freehold house on his back. But when Positivism gets into full swing, these migrations will be unnecessary. It was, we believe, one of Comte's first principles that the amplitude and uniformity of Positive education would confer on workmen an equal capacity for all trades; and the fluctuations of the labour market would thus be met, not by a movement of men, but merely by drafting so many artisans or labourers from one craft to another. The Garrisonian oracle next proclaims that "Health ought to be at once a State department, including therein, first, the negative requirements of removal of nuisances, of stopping infection and contagion, the rigorous suppression of all adulteration in articles of food, &c.; secondly, the positive task of securing adequate fresh air, numerous and accessible grounds for recreation, and a supply of faultless water." Here, again, we find Positivism, if this is Positivism, parading the stale commonplaces of every-day talk as if they were the most tremendous philosophical discoveries, things hitherto unimagined by man, and now for the first time disclosed by a Saviour of Humanity. Everybody, except Mr. Garrison, knows that health is already a State department; and there is no dispute as to the expediency or necessity in general way of attempting by the application of public power to improve the sanitary conditions of society. The only question is a practical one as to the extent to which the State can usefully interfere, so that it shall not attempt more than it can actually perform, and lull the public into a false sense of security.

We have no time to go through Mr. Garrison's proposals in detail, and it may probably be thought that it would hardly be worth while to do so. We will take only another example—Mr. Garrison's conception of the State as a model employer. He would have an entire reorganization of the public service, docks, factories, post-office, and administrative departments, on the principle of excluding all competition in wages. "Instead of making public employés public slaves, the service of the State should be a type of good employment." "All roads, railways, harbours, piers, docks, bridges, lighthouses, &c., &c., and all other works open to common use of all travelling by sea or land," which would include, we suppose, steamboats, omnibuses, and cabs, are to be transferred to the State, to be worked on the system just described, "especially excluding all competition in wages, and all purely economic objects at the expense of public convenience and the welfare of the public servant." Moreover, the hours in all kinds of Government employment are to be reduced as far as possible. This, it must be confessed, is a noble programme; and if Positivism would really do all this for us, we might wish that the "organized moral force" (kept ready to order in Bedford Row) would take charge of us at once. Apply it to cabs, for example. In this showery, sloppy weather it would obviously be a matter of great public convenience to have comfortable, rapid, and cheap cabs always at hand. The Positivist cab would be provided with the best springs, nice cushions, a fleet steed or steeds, and would be got up generally regardless of expense. The fare would be perhaps a farthing a mile, or less. The driver would be of course a highly superior man of universal culture, who could converse through the roof of a Hansom on the Hierarchy of Human Conceptions or the Calculus of Society. He would be engaged at a handsome salary, and would be provided with a neat freehold residence. We do not know whether there would be any taxes in a Positivist world, but considering how much is to be done by the State, and the noble disregard of all economical considerations which the State is to display, the expenditure would be considerable and would have to be met somehow. It is possible that the cabman and his fare, after they had paid their contributions to the common fund, might be tempted to reflect that the advantages of a freehold house or a cheap ride at the expense of the State were rather nominal than real, and that it would be better to let things find their level in the old way. It is clear that if the State were to undertake all the functions which Mr. Garrison assigns to it, it would become the great employer of all kinds of labour, and would practically fix the rates of the market. Small private employers would have to follow suit, and as they did so the State, in order to maintain its superiority, would have to go on continually raising wages and reducing hours till it could do so no longer. Mr. Garrison's Report might perhaps be considered creditable as a Utopian sketch by a smart schoolboy, who was not yet old enough to know what was being done in the world, and the practical limits of public action; but it certainly does not raise our conception of the rational capacity of the "Positivist Society" to find such crude, childlike, and, for the most part, nonsensical suggestions set before them as the sort of thing to which they are likely to attach some value. If this poor stuff is the best outcome of the Religion of Humanity, we are afraid the world will have to look elsewhere for its promised regeneration.

#### JUSTICES' CLERKS' FEES.

EVERY measure of local reform in this country seems to go through two stages. It is first permissive, and then compulsory. It is plain that a certain administrative change would be an improvement; but improvement is not to be at once forced

upon those who do not seek for it. Before everybody is compelled to accept the change, those who of their own free will are disposed towards it are allowed to accept it if they think good. Thus, when it was found out that order and property in the rural districts needed some better protection than that of the ancient parish constable, each county that thought fit was allowed, but for a while no county was compelled, to set up a reasonable and effective system of police. In this case the permissive stage is passed, and the safety of life and goods is no longer exclusively entrusted to a venerable shadow of patriarchal times. Reform of the highways was introduced in the same fashion, and reform in this case still lingers in the permissive stage. There are still counties where no Highway Boards have been organized, and where the roads are left to the care of the brother of the ancient parish constable, the ancient parish surveyor. Now there is on the whole something to be said, in certain special cases, not involving any general question of national policy, for this gradual way of doing business. It suits the English mind, which does not like to do things in a hurry, which likes to do things for itself, and objects to being dragooned into even the most desirable reforms. It gives opportunity for discussion, and gives those who consent to the change the pleasure of thinking that it was by their own wisdom that it was brought about. And it also affords the opportunity of trying and judging how the measure really works in particular districts before it is made obligatory on all. By the time the measure rises to the compulsory stage it is no longer a matter of speculation how it is likely to work, but a matter of experience how it has worked. And its working is to be judged of all the better from the first experiment having been made in quarters where it has been accepted willingly. No county or other district would like to be picked out by the central authority to have an experiment made upon it. The experiment would be sure to fail, because it would be sure not to be carried out with any hearty good will. But when a district volunteers to make the experiment on itself, then there is every chance that the change will be carried out with hearty good will; it will be a point of honour to do a thing thoroughly which has been undertaken willingly, and each district which accepts the reform will feel itself in the proud position of a light and a pillar among its benighted fellows which are still blind to their own interest. When measures are adopted in this way, there is every chance of their being fairly tried under favourable circumstances before the whole country is called on to receive them. If under such circumstances they should fail and turn out not to be real improvements after all, the country is able to draw back before the mischief has become universal.

We have spoken of the rural police and of the Highway Boards. A third measure which is now in the permissive stage is one which is less likely than the other two to force itself on the public eye, but which is really of no small importance for the good local administration of justice. This is the question of the payment of Justices' Clerks by salaries or by fees. At present the prevailing mode of payment is by fees, but it is open to the authorities of each county or borough to substitute payment by salary at its discretion. The system of salaries has as yet been adopted by about twenty-four boroughs, including such important examples as Liverpool and Birmingham, and by seven counties in England and Wales—a small proportion certainly, but including counties differing widely in area, population, character, and geographical position. For the seven burning and shining lights in this matter are the counties of Surrey, Warwick, Northumberland, Northampton, Leicester, Glamorgan, and Flint. Of these Northampton, Warwick, and Leicester certainly lie all close together in the middle of England; but Surrey, Northumberland, Glamorgan, and Flint are about as widely cut off from each other as any four counties can be. For it may be useful to explain that, though Glamorgan and Flint are both in Wales, yet they are a good way apart from one another, and we cannot see that the presence of coal in three out of four of the isolated counties can have had any tendency to make them band together to substitute salaries for fees. Altogether the counties which as yet have adopted the change seem to supply a very fair presumption in its favour.

As for the system itself of payment by fees, it is a mere relic of an antiquated way of doing things which has been given up in nearly every other case. In almost every other department it has been found that a public officer ought not to be paid by the piece, but that he should have a fair and liberal payment according to the general worth of his time and labour. But least of all should a public officer be paid by the piece when it lies a good deal in his own power to increase the number of pieces. A Justices' Clerk, who is brought into constant and close connexion with the magistrates, and who must be their adviser on many important points, ought to be a man of character and standing in his profession. Such a man ought not to be put under the necessity of eking out his income by the exaction of shillings and sixpences; he ought to be paid fairly and straightforwardly according to the value of his services. As it is, every stage of any proceeding before magistrates is marked by the payment of some fee to the clerk. Each summons issued, each oath administered, each statement recorded, carries with it some petty payment. It is wonderful how costs mount up in the most trivial case. There is a shilling for this and a shilling for that, till the magistrate's hands are really tied, and he is obliged to sit and bear the sword in vain. That is to say, in a crowd of petty cases the mere fees run up to a sum which of itself is penalty enough, or more than enough, for the offence. What is the magistrate to do? He

cannot remit the fees, to which the clerk has as good a right as to anything that belongs to him. He can hardly ask the clerk to remit them of his own free will, and the culprit is already mulcted, perhaps more than he deserves, before the law has pronounced any penalty on him at all. The magistrate is driven to "dismiss with costs," or to impose a fine which is purely nominal; that is to say, the actual sentence of the law is made lighter than it ought to be, because the expenses of the law of themselves impose a penalty which is higher than the two together ought to be. The penalty, in short, becomes indirect instead of direct; a man is punished, not for the offence which he has committed, but for his ill-luck in being brought into court for it. The magistrate is not to blame because the fine which he puts on is too low; for, if he made it higher, he would be doing a practical injustice. The clerk is not to blame because his costs are too high, for he must live and his fees are a part of his livelihood. But it is not a satisfactory state of things when the administrators of the law cannot venture to pronounce the proper sentence of the law because a further penalty, great enough, or greater than enough, is indirectly inflicted by a process beyond their control.

This line of argument may possibly to some appear over subtle; and no doubt there are many defendants who simply feel that they have to pay, and who do not greatly care whether what they pay is taken from them in the form of costs or of a fine. Still the state of things is unsatisfactory. It has an ugly look that the penalty directly inflicted by the law should be next to nothing, while the fees that go into the clerk's pocket run up to a considerable sum. But there are other practical evils about the system of paying by fees. The fee system gives the clerk a direct interest in increasing the amount of business brought before the court. The greater the number of cases brought before the magistrate, the greater the number of witnesses examined in each case that is brought, the greater is the gain of the clerk, who has his fee on every summons and every oath. It is thus the direct interest of the clerk to encourage litigation, to encourage the bringing into court of trumped-up cases which come there only to be dismissed. No doubt there are many Justices' Clerks who are quite capable of rising above any temptations to increase the number of their shillings and florins in this fashion. What we say is that the law should not expose public officers to temptations of this kind, which many doubtless withstand, but to which some may possibly yield. When this argument is used, it is commonly met by saying that, if the clerks are paid by salary, they will be equally exposed to a temptation of another kind. As it is, we are told, it is the clerk's interest to let nothing slip by, to do everything thoroughly. If he is paid by a salary, he will be tempted to be less vigilant, and to do his duty in a mere perfunctory manner. No doubt there is truth in this. It is hard to find any circumstances in life in which there are not some special difficulties and temptations; but those who use this argument seem commonly to take for granted that the balance of vice and virtue is so oddly arranged in the mind of a Justices' Clerk that, so long as he is paid by fees, he will be quite safe against the temptation of unduly increasing those fees; while, if he is paid by salary, he will at once yield to the temptation of pocketing his salary and neglecting his duty. As a matter of moral philosophy, the danger would seem to be equally great in either case, and as Justices' Clerks are men, and differ among themselves like other men, it may be that the one temptation might have most influence on some minds, and the other temptation on others. But the argument about the clerks, if paid by salaries, being tempted to neglect their duties is an argument which proves too much. If it is worth anything at all, it would show that all public functionaries should, whenever possible, be paid by fees rather than by salaries, because all public functionaries, and not Justices' Clerks only, must be liable to this temptation of neglecting their duties. But experience has shown in most other cases that this danger is not so great as the danger the other way, and the tendency of modern legislation has steadily been to substitute salaries for fees whenever it can be done. We think that the *onus probandi* lies with the defenders of fees. It is for them to show that there is some reason why Justices' Clerks should be an exception to a rule which is now generally accepted. For our own part, we should think that the temptation to neglect of duty would be less strong in the case of a Justices' Clerk than in that of most public officers. For the Justices' Clerk discharges the greater part of his duties immediately under the eye of those by whom he is appointed, to whom he is responsible, and by whom he may be dismissed.

The Bill now before the House of Commons, brought in by Sir David Salomons, proposes to carry out everywhere the change which has already been made in certain counties and boroughs. An equivalent salary is to be paid to the clerk instead of fees, the fees going to the county or borough, and the magistrate having the power of remitting them at his discretion. The clerk would thus no longer have any pecuniary interest in the business of the court. And the magistrate would be able to meet the class of cases of which we have spoken, where the fees run up to an amount utterly disproportionate to the fine which is the actual legal penalty. He would be able in every case to impose a fine, without regard to anything but the justice of the case; remitting, whenever there was any reason, the whole or any part of the fees.

As some county economists may possibly fear that the payment of a salary to the clerks, and the power of remitting the fees, may between them amount to a fresh burden on the county rate, it may be well to mention that, according to a Parliamentary return,

the change is on the whole economical. Among the counties which have made the experiment some have gained and some have lost. If mineral Glamorgan has lost 218*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.*, suburban Surrey has gained 289*l.* 18*s.* 2*d.* But on the aggregate of the seven counties the loss is 363*l.* 7*s.* 7*d.*, while the gain is 468*l.* 4*s.* These figures are decidedly cheering for rural Chancellors of the Exchequer.

A question was raised some years back whether the preamble of an Act of Parliament was necessarily infallible truth. When we think of the Acts of the sixteenth century out of which the question arose, the question is, to say the least, a knotty one. But if the present Bill becomes law, those who give to the preamble what they refuse to the Pope will have a new argument in their favour. We hold it for incontestable truth that, in the words of the present preamble, "it is expedient to improve the administration of justice at petty sessions by providing for the payment of Clerks to Justices by salaries in lieu of fees."

#### THE ROYAL ACADEMY.

I.

ONCE again it becomes difficult to answer the question universally asked, "Is the Academy Exhibition good or bad?" Of course the Prime Minister and other distinguished guests at the annual dinner proclaim each year with flourish of trumpets that the Exhibition at which they are called on to assist does infinite credit to all concerned. But the Academy dinner-table cannot be accounted, at least since the days of Sir Charles Eastlake, a board of criticism, though we have seldom met with a better defence of independent and truth-seeking criticism than in the speech of Mr. Gladstone. Yet one characteristic of the present Exhibition, in common with its immediate predecessors, is that the majority of the works have no claim to criticism at all; any one accustomed to these annual gatherings will find that the rooms present so much their accustomed aspect that even a catalogue is almost superfluous. The collection may serve, however, to suggest some not unimportant conclusions. The year 1872, if ever it shall be remembered in the history of art, will be conspicuous by the paucity of great works; not a single Academician can be named who has surpassed himself. The pictures selected for the large *salon d'honneur* prove by their small dimensions that artists, governed probably by commercial considerations, do not care to commit themselves to creations for which there is no immediate market. The three works honoured with chief places in the Banquet Gallery compare to disadvantage with pictures thus distinguished in former years. Sir Edwin Landseer's "Baptismal Font" (190) is but the ghost of a picture. Mr. Sant's Royal portraits (259), though painted by command, can scarcely compare with the historic and imaginative compositions produced in former years by Mr. Maciße and Mr. Leighton. The third picture signalized by the hangers is for art merit the foremost in the Gallery; it occupies the place of Moses in the last Academy, and the painter is the same. But in lieu of Moses, Aaron, and Hur, Mr. Millais favours us with the portraits of three young ladies at a game of cards— "Hearts are Trumps" (223). A like descent might be pointed to in the other rooms; and even when high art has been aimed at, the good intention fails of realization. Thus we must regard as partial failures Mr. Poynter's "Perseus and Andromeda" (505), and Mr. Watts's diploma picture, the punishment of Cain (658). Yet in the same imaginative sphere we may name, as successes, "Summer Moon" (202), by Mr. Leighton, and "The Lament of Ariadne" (498), by Mr. W. B. Richmond, the son of the Academician. This last ranks as one of the grandest conceptions of the year. But these more ambitious creations are few and far between; indeed full nine-tenths of the wall space are occupied by superlative mercantile products which appeal to a public that deems imagination a snare and intellect an intrusion. An educated foreigner who should visit the Exhibition for the first time would feel himself a little perplexed. The Academy, so the President informs the world, is an ancient, venerable, and wealthy institution which uses its money and power for the welfare of art, and especially for the education of the artist. And yet the intelligent stranger, applying to the exhibition the standards upheld in the Academies of the Continent, would be led to the conclusion that English painters belong to the class of self-educated men who do not gather learning in the lecture-rooms or ateliers of Academies, but casually pick up such knowledge as they need by the wayside, and thus end pretty much where they began, incompetent to encounter technical difficulties, or to compass complex and weighty arguments. And yet we think it must be conceded that in no Exhibition throughout Europe is the general average so uniformly good. Whatever may be wanting to the 58 members of the Academy here represented is supplied by the 861 outsiders who rush to the rescue. So large a constituency renders the collection truly representative; thus this one hundred and fourth Exhibition, though it falls short of what we have a right to hope for, may be consulted as a true index to the contemporary art of the country.

So evenly is the Exhibition balanced that it is a little difficult to know where to begin. On entering the first room a picture of unusual power meets the eye, "King Charles I. leaving Westminster Hall after Sentence of Death had been Passed" (42), a work which fully justifies the election of Sir John Gilbert. The King, though not quite up to the Vandyc type of dejected dignity and high-born grace, bears himself nobly and quietly. The story

is clearly and compactly told; the situation well seized; the action, specially in the hands, has dramatic intensity. The heads too are finely modelled and forcibly painted. Yet, taken altogether, this oil picture is inferior to the artist's drawings in the "Old Water Colour Society"; the pigments are less transparent and lucid, the draperies are wanting in definition, the execution is ragged. The study to which the artist has submitted is scarcely sufficient for canvas of this large scale. Yet in the essential elements of conception and noble treatment there is no more worthy historic work within the Academy. An identical subject, "Charles I. leaving Westminster Hall after his Trial" (107), we owe to Mr. Potts, who a year or two ago in the Academy entered the ranks of historic art. The painter here relies for dramatic effect, which however he somewhat too painfully and coarsely intensifies, on the strong contrast between Charles, calm in bearing, and the riotous rabble with clay pipes and leather aprons. It is easy for an artist to go too far in the realization of revolting scenes of violence. Delaroche, when depicting the indignities thrust on the martyr-king, transgressed the bounds of moderation; and if we may be permitted a further illustration, we would say that painters in the decadence of Christian art carried the scenes of scourging, buffeting, and spitting to a point not permissible. The moment the right limit is transgressed high art becomes low art. In the picture before us it may be pleaded in extenuation that touches of pathos and of pity are thrown in. On the whole the composition has been well thought out, and the execution is vigorous, yet painstaking. Mr. Ward is another artist who makes good capital out of the calamities of kings. But the incident he chooses has the misfortune of being crowded together within the narrow confines of a coach, and want of light follows want of space. The subject is impressive, and the treatment is in more senses than one, weighty. This "Return from Flight" (182), is the return of the French Royal Family to Paris after their unsuccessful attempt at escape. Louis XVI., Marie Antoinette, the Dauphin, Dauphiness, and Princess Elizabeth are all huddled together in a cumbrous, top-heavy vehicle, which required six horses to draw it. . . . Henceforth the life of the monarch, of the queen, of his family, the throne, and the safety of France were at the mercy of the caprice of the most capricious people." At the window of the coach are seen a clamorous rabble thrusting on the inmates bayonet, dagger, and the red cap of liberty; but the Royal Family, though fear-stricken, are calm and resigned. The story is told with clutching power; the handling, though occasionally heavy and dense, manages to unite delicacy with force. We incline to think that the colour would gain refinement by the use of quiet greys in place of hot browns and piercing reds; the red cap of liberty unfortunately serves as a keynote to the violent concords. Yet the picture, though not faultless, must be accepted as one of the most earnest of recent efforts to reach to the dignity and solemnity of historic art.

For lack of these qualities several minor works fall short of the goal which cleverness and agility might win. Mr. Marcus Stone has chosen for play of wit "Edward II. and his Favourite, Piers Gaveston" (111). We are told that Gaveston, the Adonis of the Court, was accustomed to deride and mimic the English nobles for the amusement of his thoughtless Sovereign. The artist, accustomed to tread with light fantastic step the byways of history, excuses frivolity by cleverness; a jeer and a jest, fleeting as if writ in water, are fixed in perpetuity on canvas; the picture, when complete, becomes pointed, smart, and sparkling as a scene at the Gaiety Theatre. Mr. Stone seemingly shirks labour; with the confidence of an expert he strikes with direct thrust at his results. "Holyrood, 26th May, 1563" (479), by Mr. Kilburne, is yet another composition wholly wanting in historic import. It is of little avail that the catalogue identifies the canvas with Mary Queen of Scots and the palace of Holyrood; the smallness and triviality of the style, the dressy prettiness of the whole get-up, belong to the boudoir and the drawing-room. Painters should not attempt history save when they know how to impart to their characters dignity of manner and nobility of motive. Mr. Kilburne, favourably known in water-colours, is a very neat workman; indeed the picture in question has a finish and refinement altogether faultless. Mrs. E. M. Ward favours us with a pleasing and sparkling scene—"Mrs. Delaney at Court," "The Queen's Lodge, Windsor, in 1786" (510). The canvas is spangled with colours like a garland of flowers; the eye finds delight, but no repose; the picture wants unity and tone; the gay pigments are not sufficiently modified by shade. And yet in this home gathering, where are seen pleasantly occupied the King, the Queen, and the Royal children, there are passages supremely well painted; and as a study of character the Academy does not afford a head more striking and expressive than that of dear old Mrs. Delaney, here seated as much at her ease as in her own parlour. "The Arrest of Anne Boleyn" (497), by Mr. Wynfield, may be mentioned as a painstaking work. The Queen's proverbially fine profile is brought out with good effect. We add, only for the sake of an example of what may be termed a parody or burlesque on history, Mr. Cope's feeble yet pretentious composition, "Oliver Cromwell receiving a Deputation of Ministers and Elders accompanied by the Dutch Ambassador" (368). The catalogue kindly informs us of the presence of John Milton; the head does indeed need an explanatory or apologetic label of some sort. Historic art is in fact here carried back to those pre-portrait days when the name of each figure, with an appropriate sentiment, was clearly written out, so that the painter's shortcomings might be supplied by the penman.

"A Dream of Fair Women" (363) pleasantly takes us back to the period when architecture called in the aid of her younger sister, painting. Mr. Armitage in this "design for a frieze" groups in one long panorama "the women of the Old Testament," beginning with Eve nude, and ending with Semiramis robed and crowned. Jephtha's daughter, the Queen of Sheba, Judith, and other Biblical characters identified with beauty, dignity, or heroism, are ranged in processional sequence on an elevated plateau looking down upon palm trees and distant hills. Symbols and accessories, such as a leopard, a leveret, a lamb, or some flower or leaf, which bespeak a character or define a country, are so placed as to add circumstance to the story and completeness to the composition; the purpose being balance, symmetry, and just apportionment of space, which are conditions essential to mural decoration. Carl Müller in the painted chapel at Remagen on the Rhine has executed in fresco a lovely group of "Women from the Old Testament," but his style is somewhat romantic. In comparison Mr. Armitage throws into his treatment less beauty and more dignity, less softness and more severity, and thus conforms to the requirements of monumental decoration. This composition, the first of a series, is well fitted for the painting in fresco of a spacious and stately interior. The general conception owes much to the processional frieze of M. Flandrin in Paris, and to the not less famous friezes in the churches of Ravenna. Another study by the same artist commemorates "The Great Fire at Chicago" (1323). America and England, personified by benevolent maidens, bend over a figure stricken down and desolate. "I was thirsty and ye gave me drink, naked and ye clothed me." The study of the figure naked and prostrate on the ground might have been made in the school of Raffaelle; but before the design is carried out on a large scale it will be well for the artist to revise certain lines which repeat themselves weakly and monotonously. Mr. Armitage in a third work, "The Dawn of the First Easter Sunday" (41), does not lack power; the action of Mary Magdalene is highly dramatic; we might, however, desire more dignity for Simon Peter; objection, too, may be taken to the topography of Jerusalem; the position given, for instance, to the three crosses would seem an impossibility. We have walked over the ground, but cannot identify the sites here depicted; yet the painter apparently aims at matter-of-fact realization. Close by we encounter a picture by an artist who has never been known to sacrifice his ideal to sober facts or simple nature; and yet in the whole Exhibition there is not a more commonplace composition than Mr. Thorburn's "Song of the Heavenly Host at the time of the Nativity" (37). It says little for the high estate of our English school that the weakest works are those which concern religion. "The Children rise up and call her Blessed" (235), by Mr. Dobson, is refined, but conventional; the forms are of a pre-conceived ideal which dispenses with nature; the hands and the articulations of the joints are without definition, the draperies are little more than sacks. Such art, though not without a charm, has finality written against it. Mr. Houghton errs in quite an opposite direction; "John the Baptist rebuking Herod" (1132) is in a style more profane than sacred. Herod and the Baptist are so disfigured as to raise a smile; the whole composition—one figure of Sibyl-like grandeur only excepted—seems to pertain to the region of comedy. The clever but eccentric painter has committed a grave mistake; evidently his walk in art does not lie in the Holy Land, but in America; an Indian with a tomahawk is more in his way than a prophet or a king.

The rapid survey we have now attempted of the comparatively few historic and semi-historic works on view leads to the conclusion that Academicians and others had never heard of the golden truism enunciated over the dinner-table by Mr. Gladstone, that "the intelligent worship of beauty constitutes the basis of all excellence in art." Next week we propose to turn to works of the imagination.

#### THE THEATRES.

THE production at the Queen's Theatre of a new comedy called *Ordeal by Touch* deserves special notice, because the author appears to have acted under the belief, which is not shared by all his brethren, that the composition of a drama is a literary work. He has written his play as carefully as another author might write a poem or an essay, and as this is said to be his first work, there is hope that he may produce other and better works which may help to preserve to the English theatre the character which it has nearly lost, of an intellectual amusement. The descriptions which have appeared of the first night's performance may possibly have produced an impression that this play has greater merit than it really has; but probably the audience only expressed, although with some extravagance, their delight at discovering one more Englishman who could write what might almost deserve to be called a comedy. The success of the play was, however, remarkable, and all the more so because the earlier part, which is in itself merely tedious, was rendered positively disagreeable by the super-abundant energy of Mrs. Scott Siddons. There is a scene in a garden in which two other characters discourse, while this lady crouches behind an exceedingly small flower-vase and performs an accompaniment of vigorous gesticulation. This perhaps is the way they do it in the provinces, where, as we understand, Mrs. Scott Siddons has been practising her art. If we were to seek for what is called in critical jargon the "accentuation" of this lady's acting, we should find it in every word she utters,

every look she assumes, and every movement she makes. In a play of this kind scenery and accessories are of small importance; but still we would venture to suggest, as an improvement, that the flower-vase behind which Mrs. Scott Siddons crouches should be made rather larger. As a beautiful mechanical contrivance, nearly approaching to perpetual motion, this lady might be surveyed by a succession of admiring crowds at the International Exhibition, but at the Queen's Theatre she needs, we think, occasional mitigation. It so happens that the scene in the garden is well acted by the parties to it, but the amusement of the audience is probably not enhanced by the energetic pantomime which is proceeding behind the flower-vase. They cannot need to be reminded that this is the celebrated Mrs. Scott Siddons who has been engaged expressly for the part; and although Widow Coralie is a sort of Providence in petticoats, she might usefully consider that omniscience is usually associated with invisibility. We do not in the least undervalue the talent of Mrs. Scott Siddons or the success which she achieved, and it is an unpleasant duty to advert to the possibility of an able performance approximating to the confines of boredom. But still it is undeniably possible to have too much of a good thing, and if we might venture to give a word of familiar advice to this clever actress, it would be, in her earlier scenes, "to draw it mild." Conceive a male orator doing what is vulgarly called the pump-handle business incessantly throughout a long speech, and you will gain some idea of the effect upon spectators of the indefatigable activity of the muscles of Mrs. Scott Siddons. She exhibits at the same time a self-confidence and complacency which are rather irritating to observers who think that, even if she knows how to do everything, she still has to learn how to leave some things undone. She has probably heard of flashes of silence, and she may be recommended to aim at producing bursts of inactivity.

The literary aspect of this play deserves almost unqualified commendation. There is one rather unfortunate passage which suggests that it has acquired some of that maturity which high authorities recommend both for wine and manuscript. A French officer exchanges compliments with an English officer in reference to the Crimean war, and adds that his nation were never defeated except by that to which his new friend belongs. But when an author is advised to keep his work so many years in a desk, it is implied that he should revise the work when he takes it out, and in that process he might be expected to have regard to such an important event as the Franco-German war. It is undesirable that foreigners should derive from this play the impression that in England it is generally believed that Waterloo is the last great battle that has been fought, and that we are as well satisfied with our military position as Mrs. Scott Siddons is with her own acting. The tone of public feeling is much more nearly expressed in an amusing adaptation of *La Vie Parisienne* at the Holborn Theatre, where a Swedish baron, newly arrived in London, is introduced to General Post Office as one of the military celebrities of England. The Baron, who is purposing to write a book on the country which he is visiting, naturally addresses to the General a question as to the strength of the army of which he is a distinguished officer, but the only answer is a mournful shake of the head. "Oh!" says the Baron, "I perceive that I have touched a delicate point"; whereupon there is considerable applause. The British public is well aware of the absurdity of demeaning itself on the political stage as a combination of Providence and Mrs. Scott Siddons, the influence of which everywhere operates irresistibly for good. To do ourselves justice, the nation is not content to repose on the memory of a time when it showed to Germany the way to contend successfully against France. However, we have dwelt sufficiently upon a single blemish of a play of which the ultimate success was rendered more conspicuous by the difficulties and disapprobation under which it struggled in its early scenes. The critics recommend, as usually they may safely do, compression; but a manager must always remember that he cannot greatly reduce the length of a play without putting something in place of the omitted matter. And further, there is such a thing as tediousness with an object. It may be said in favour of the padding of this, as compared with other plays, that at any rate the characters talk, and do not merely perform the sword exercise or pour out tea. Moreover the young gentlemen and ladies who make love in the studio of Madame Coralie, although their business is at the best insipid, might do it better than they do. It must be remembered that the passion of the banker's son for the sister of his cashier is the foundation on which the whole structure of the play depends, and although many of Madame Coralie's displays of sagacity might be made elsewhere than in her studio, or even omitted, yet her profession of sculptor is essential to that close observation of the banker which gives her the clue to his past life. We think, besides, that critics are ill advised in encouraging the public to believe that impatience is a proof of intellectual superiority. The French dramatist has this enormous advantage over his English brother, that he writes for a public who will listen with critical attention to long speeches. The Elizabethan dramatists, like all other writers of the same age, seem to have gone upon the principle that, if you have anything to say, you should be as long in saying it as possible. It is remarkable that an age which exhibits an enormous, and even expanding, appetite for long-winded oratory in Parliament and at the Bar, should demand that upon the stage speeches should be cut as short as possible. Like people who travel always by express trains, although they have nothing whatever to do at their journey's end,

an audience at a theatre can endure only exciting scenes, although even a moderately good play well acted ought to be more entertaining than an evening at home. We admire a French audience listening with almost religious devotion to every line of a comedy of Molière, and we envy authors who can write plays like that most agreeable trifle, *Les Pattes de Mouche*, feeling certain that they cater for a public which will be content to dine on nothing if it is elegantly dressed.

The Prince of Wales's Theatre has acquired a high reputation for care and finish, and the experiment of producing Lord Lytton's *Money* has been so conducted as to ensure considerable success. Yet we cannot help remarking that author, or manager, or both, must have a strange conception of the interior of a West-end Club-house, and we cannot admire the farcical expedient adopted of introducing a testy gentleman who calls loudly and frequently to the waiter for a snuff-box which exists for the general use of members of the Club. The combination of reading, smoking, and card-rooms in one may perhaps be conceded to dramatic exigency, but unless we had been informed by the playbill that the scene was a Club, we might have supposed ourselves to be contemplating the interior of a porthouse. On the morning after the gambling scene at the Club the hero receives visitors at home. He is arrayed suitably to the time of day in a dressing-gown of overwhelming splendour, and perhaps we are to infer the intensity of the previous night's orgies from the circumstance that he appears to have forgotten to take off his black trowsers and boots before going to bed. The weight of the piece rests mainly upon this one character, and it is no mean test of an actor's skill that he can deliver a succession of sentimental speeches, all beginning "Clara," without becoming ridiculous. Some other parts which are in themselves of no great importance derive interest from the appearance of favourite actors in them. It is satisfactory to observe that an English comedy well performed will attract a full house of the upper classes, and managers of other theatres will do well to imitate as far as possible that careful preparation which has made *Money* acceptable to a fastidious audience. The difficulty of inducing actors of marked merit to accept any except leading parts accounts for most of the imperfections which we painfully observe in the production of almost every considerable play. The newspapers inform us that Mr. Pennington has been reading Shakespeare before a fashionable audience at Mr. Gladstone's house, and we are reminded that some months ago Mr. Gladstone witnessed this gentleman's performance in *King John* at a decidedly unfashionable theatre. We did not ourselves imitate the Premier's example, and we do not mind confessing that, however well Mr. Pennington was likely to act, we expected that some of his associates would act atrociously. It is a pity that every promising actor demands for himself leading parts; and there is no theatre rich and popular enough to make even small places in its bills worth acceptance by rising men. The play of *Virginius* was lately produced at the Queen's Theatre. The father and daughter were excellently performed by Mr. Ryder and Miss Hodson, but there was ample room for one or two more good actors in the cast. The same remark applies to the new comedy at the same house. Admit that it depends for its success almost entirely on Mrs. Scott Siddons, and that she is fully equal to the burden, still the quality of a good actor or actress might be shown in making the early scenes of the play durable. Perhaps in his next play this author will contrive to give his subordinate characters greater weight. It must be owned, after all, that *Ordeal by Touch* is a work of great and varied power, and the prospects of the English stage are brightened by the production of such a comedy.

## REVIEWS.

THE FOUNDERS OF THE BELGIAN MONARCHY.\*

UNDER the title of "The Founders of the Belgian Monarchy," M. Théodore Juste has written an interesting series of biographies of the principal statesmen and diplomats who co-operated in an enterprise which was more difficult and more perilous than, after forty years of success and prosperity, the present generation would readily suppose. If there are any who, in spite of that success, are still inclined to doubt whether the separation of the Belgian provinces from the kingdom of the Low Countries was conducive to the interests of European peace, or to that equilibrium of forces which was formerly considered the surest guarantee for weaker States against the ambition of the strong, there can be none who do not recognize in the admirable example of ordered freedom, of political sagacity, and of industrial and commercial progress which the Belgian kingdom has afforded to its neighbours, the extraordinary merits of the men who laid the foundations of its independence. Of these men, the one who forms the subject of the ninth of M. Juste's biographies has especial claims upon the regard of Englishmen; indeed, by long residence among us, by family alliance, and by a peculiar and quite exceptional position as the representative of the Court most nearly allied to our own and the most intimate and confidential adviser of his sovereign, M. Van de Weyer has for the best portion of a public life concerned with the highest cares and responsi-

\* *Les Fondateurs de la Monarchie Belge: Sylvain Van de Weyer, Ministre d'Etat.* Par Théodore Juste. 2 vols. London: Trübner & Co.

bilities, made England something more than his second country. It may be said without exaggeration that of the two countries, the country of his birth and the country of his adoption, he has loved both with little difference of affection, and served both with little difference of fidelity. And if in these pages it is the Belgian patriot and the Belgian statesman that shines out conspicuous for his public virtue, his undeviating loyalty, his strength of purpose, his fertility and flexibility of intellect, his rare discernment and various capacity, we in England are particularly attracted to this story of an illustrious career by the testimony of his biographer that his name and fame belong to us only less than to his own fellow-citizens of Brabant. The study of the negotiations, in which M. Van de Weyer played the most important part, for the establishment of the Belgian kingdom, inspires M. Juste with the generous reflection that "the Belgians hardly know enough what they owe to England." However this may be, it is probable that not even all the Belgian readers of this biography know how much their country owes to the revolutionary leader who never departed from moderation and good sense; to the diplomatist who overcame all difficulties by fortitude and firmness of spirit, by force of character, by a judgment never at fault, by an equal temper and an exquisite courtesy; to the statesman who to wide knowledge and various learning united the wisdom of the philosopher and the genius of good sense; to the jurist, to the professor, to the advocate, and to the man of letters who, armed at all points and never at a loss for an argument, an illustration, an epigram, or a word of good counsel in season, was strong enough to abash a Talleyrand, to convince a Wellington, to persuade a Palmerston, and to take his place, as one native and to the manner born, in the loftiest and the most cultivated regions of the proudest and most fastidious society in the world. Nor is this biography rich in personal interest and instruction only. It is charged with interest for every new comer into public life, for it shows that true simplicity of character and goodness of heart may strengthen rather than impair the qualities which command success in public transactions and in the pursuits of personal ambition. M. Van de Weyer was a devoted student and an indefatigable worker for years before the grand opportunity of his life arrived—an opportunity which he could not have foreseen, but for which he was found fully prepared. A glance at these chapters will, unless we are greatly mistaken, supply a moral lesson to be learnt with profit by political beginners.

M. Sylvain Van de Weyer was born at Louvain in 1802. His father, a patriotic citizen of substance, had served as a captain of Volunteers during the Brabantian Revolution; and his mother, according to Sydney Smith's testimony, was a woman of remarkable character and intellect. After the annexation of Holland to the French Empire his father became a special commissary at Amsterdam, and the son was destined for the navy, and as a pupil at the Naval School took part in a review held by the Emperor Napoleon in 1811. A little later the boy was by no means an unconcerned witness of the national rising against the foreign conqueror. After the fall of the Empire and the creation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, he returned to his native town, and became a pupil of M. Van Meenen, a celebrated jurist and an ardent Liberal, under whom he studied law and philosophy with earnest diligence, and took part in the management of the *Observateur*, a journal of which his master was chief editor. He worked so diligently and to such excellent purpose that in his eighteenth year he was admitted, after a summary examination, to the Faculty of Law at the Louvain University; and in the autumn of 1820, being on a first visit to Paris, he was charged to hand to M. Laromiguère, whose course of moral philosophy was then in great renown, a communication from M. Van Meenen, with some remarks in the form of an essay on a recent work of Condillac's eminent disciple. In his letters describing this interview the future Minister of State displays the lively and penetrating observation which was afterwards to be so brilliantly employed on more difficult and delicate missions. It was on this occasion that he made acquaintance with Béranger, who was surprised to hear that the Belgians were not at all desirous of being reannexed to France. One of the Professors at Louvain had conceived a scheme of universal instruction. The young Van de Weyer attended his lectures, and laughed at them in a very witty pamphlet, and a vigorous satire in verse, in which he defended the use of the French language, which the eccentric Professor had condemned, against the Dutch, which the Government required to be taught. At this time the students of the Belgian Universities were much given to political discussion, and M. Van de Weyer presided over one of their debating clubs. Being summoned to Brussels by the Minister of Public Instruction to answer for a lampoon which had alarmed the academical authorities at Louvain, he impressed the Minister so favourably that he was offered a scientific mission to Germany, and a Professor's chair on his return. He declined both, and, in August 1823, received his degree as Doctor of Law, after a severe examination, and was called to the bar. Contrary to usage, instead of taking the text of his diploma thesis from the Code, he wrote a Latin dissertation on "Duty," in refutation of the utilitarian theories of Jeremy Bentham, who at a later period became so attached to the Plenipotentiary as to remember him in his will. He published a strong article against the preliminary censorship of the Faculty, and so decided was the effect of this article that it overcame the objections of the Faculty, who admitted him to his degree *magna cum laude*.

Before and after his call to the Bar he continued to distinguish

himself in polemical and philosophical literature, and while clients were flowing in upon the eloquent advocate, he was appointed by the Regency of Brussels Librarian to the city, and charged by the Government with the care of the precious collection of MSS. of the Duke of Burgundy. In these functions he won the esteem and regard of all the various visitors with whom he came in contact; with some of whom he certainly could have felt no other sympathy than that of a kindly nature with fallen fortunes—such as the regicide Barrère, and Thibaudieu, the exiled revolutionist of the Convention. His intellectual activity was incessant; he was editing the treatises of the famous Dutch philosopher of the last century, Hemsterhuis, and founding an association for the dissemination of popular instruction and the cultivation of a sound morality among the poorer classes; pleading in the courts for prosecuted newspapers; addressing to young men, in the form of Horatian satires and epistles, charming admonitions against idleness and prodigality, and admirably humorous counsels of charitable economy; composing delightfully ingenious moral essays, always animated with a practical purpose, and never mistaking dulness for profundity; and manifesting a singularly early maturity of thought and experience in those *Thoughts on Different Subjects* which were republished in London in 1863. In 1827 M. Van de Weyer was lecturing on the history of Philosophy in the Museum of Arts and Sciences at Brussels, and resisted an injunction to lecture in the Dutch language. His inaugural address was widely and warmly praised, notably by Victor Cousin in his *Journal des Savants*. In 1828 he paid a second visit to Paris, and was heartily welcomed by the choicest political and intellectual society in the French capital. After having contributed for three years to the literary portion of the official journal of the Government of the Netherlands, he attached himself to the principal organ of the Belgian Opposition, in which he defended with his pen the cause of Liberal institutions, which, in the person of M. de Potter (afterwards his somewhat intractable colleague in the first days of the Revolution) he defended with moving eloquence in an Assize Court. In that speech, in reply to the Public Prosecutor's contemptuous observations on the political press, he avowed with honest pride that he had been a journalist for many years, and claimed respect for the public services of independent and conscientious writers. Grossly insulted by a political antagonist in the *Journal de Gand*, he demanded and obtained an instant retraction, and excused himself in a published letter for having peremptorily insisted on satisfaction for outraged personal honour. All this time the agitation of the Belgian Liberals against the Dutch Government continued and increased, and M. Van de Weyer was called upon again and again to appear against the law officers of the Government for his clients of the Liberal press and the Constitutional Associations, without relaxing for a day his favourite studies and pursuits as a scholar, an antiquary, and a bibliophilist. We may note here, as a characteristic of the good feeling and good taste that never deserted him in the most ardent controversies and conflicts, his withdrawal from a journal in which a virulent article upon the private life of the Prince of Orange had appeared. When at length the Revolution arrived, it discovered in him a safe and steadfast guide, and not one of those vulgar adventurers whom public troubles sweep into ephemeral popularity and power.

In the evening of the 25th of August, 1830, the insurrectionary movement began at Brussels, and the first act of M. Van de Weyer, on his arrival from Louvain, was to place a guard of fifty men over the Library and its treasures entrusted to his care. Chosen secretary of a Committee of Notables of the Civic Guard, and one of five delegates charged to draw up a national remonstrance for presentation to the King, M. Van de Weyer resolutely opposed the violent party, saying, " '89, by all means; '93, certainly not." Attached to the staff of the Civic Guard in the capacity of counsel, he attended a deputation to the Prince of Orange at Laeken, and when at length the Prince had consented to enter the capital, convulsed with tumult and barricaded, with no other military escort than his personal staff, he made his way at the risk of his life to the palace, and after stating with many frankness the grievances of his fellow-citizens, consented to form part of a Commission for restoring tranquillity. He begged the heir to the throne to put himself at the head of the Belgians, and undertook to maintain the public peace for a fortnight until the return of the Prince from the Hague. On the 7th of September, the answer from the King to the demand for the separation of the two kingdoms was so unsatisfactory that M. Van de Weyer proposed the selection of a Provisional Government from the members of the States-General. This proposal was subsequently modified, and a Commission of Safety was composed of eight out of sixteen candidates chosen by the Regency, of whom M. Van de Weyer was one, to conduct the national movement and maintain order. The King's Speech at the opening of a special Session of the States-General at the Hague on the 13th September was so far from reassuring to the Belgian patriots, that all M. Van de Weyer's courage and constancy were needed to restrain the popular commotion. The Commission of Safety was soon discredited by its moderation; but M. Van de Weyer's ready wit and presence of mind were sufficient to reduce to silence and contempt a silly agitator who called for blood instead of speeches. When at length the Royal troops had surrounded the city, and the fate of the Revolution was to be decided by force, and the people had taken the Hôtel de Ville by storm, M. Van de Weyer confronted without flinching all the perils of the crisis, though

not without some secret momentary misgivings. Escaping to Valenciennes, where other leading patriots were assembled, he decided them to appeal to the people for an organized resistance in the provinces, and to march with all the civil forces upon the capital. To sound the tocsin of revolt, to inspire and animate the insurgents, was comparatively easy; to preserve the Revolution from anarchy and from a dictatorship, and to organize an administration without an army or a treasury, demanded a combination of energy and prudence not often associated in revolutionary leaders. Throughout those anxious days M. Van de Weyer was the very life and soul of the Central Committee. In five days, under his calm and vigorous direction, it had reconstructed the entire political, military, and judicial fabric of the State, convoked a Congress, and astonished Europe by the restoration of order and the preservation of liberty, by the collection of taxes and the regular administration of public justice, as if the Government had only changed its name. The truth was, that the members of the new Government had set the example of self-sacrifice; M. Van de Weyer's father publicly declared that he would accept no promotion in the magistracy so long as his son remained in power. Many capital anecdotes are related of M. Van de Weyer's happy tact and never-failing wit in these extremes of the national fortune; as when, for instance, the Prince of Orange invited him to Antwerp, and he asked the aide-de-camp whether the Prince commanded the citadel and the troops. The aide-de-camp replying with some hesitation in the negative, "Pray tell the Prince," rejoined the member of the Provisional Government, "that I was on the point of accepting his invitation, but that I have an instinctive horror of all citadels and troops which are not commanded by his Royal Highness."

Such, in brief, was the first and foremost episode of M. Van de Weyer's political career. We must now accompany him on his first mission to the country in which he was destined to find the lasting happiness of his life, and to fix his home in calmer times to come. But the great enterprise on which he was engaged was to be fulfilled only after many weary and anxious days and sleepless nights, many months and years of arduous labour, incessant vigilance, painful uncertainties and delays. It was a task that needed consummate dexterity and inexhaustible patience. It was nothing less than to persuade the cautious and conservative statesmanship of England to consent to the infraction of a treaty which had been signed but fifteen years before by all the great Powers at the close of the mighty struggle with Napoleon, as a security for the balance of power and the peace of Europe, and of those very articles in the treaty which had been designed as barriers against the restless ambition of France; to induce the Government of England to undo its own work, and allow an ally who had fought under Wellington at Waterloo to be despoiled of half his kingdom; to take advantage of the French revolutionary impulse, and yet to restrain and defeat intrigues and schemes of annexation or partition very thinly disguised by French diplomacy; to appease the displeasure of Russia, Austria, and Prussia; to profit by the Reform movement in England and the accession of the Liberal party to power, without alienating or alarming Conservative interests and prejudices; and all this in the face of popular excitement and revolutionary impatience in Belgium, of reactionary conspiracies, of a national Congress agitated by conflicting hopes and fears, and of the obstinate determination of the Royal House of Nassau to yield only at the last moment to overwhelming necessity. It is easy for the present generation, who are accustomed to see Belgium happy, free, prosperous, and secure, to forget the dangers and the difficulties from which the little State at length emerged. The story of its birth-throes and its early struggles is told in the two volumes of this biography of the statesman to whom of all others belongs the credit of having rescued his country from internal anarchy, from the penalties of a violent dynastic reconquest, and from foreign annexation. M. Van de Weyer would have been content perhaps, at the outset of the Revolution, with full measure of local self-government and complete administrative independence under the House of Nassau. But the Dutch dynasty, like the King of Egypt, hardened its heart, and would not let the people go; and it became a question for the Belgian patriots of being proscribed as rebels or of abjuring their allegiance. They resolved, at the risk of life and fortune, on complete separation, and there was a moment of despair when they would even have proclaimed a Republic to save their honour and their liberties. The known determination of the national leaders made it the interest of the great monarchies to accept a compromise of their pretensions, and it was in the conduct of the negotiations by which this compromise was concluded that M. Van de Weyer's vigour and discretion overcame all obstacles, and achieved a final and complete success. The Reform Bill, which brought a Liberal Ministry into power in England, was a very happy stroke of fate for the Belgians. Lord Palmerston took up their cause, and made a naval demonstration in the Downs at the critical moment when a French army had crossed the frontier to compel the Dutch to retire. And then it appeared that Belgian independence had only escaped one peril to fall into another. It required all Lord Palmerston's courage and decision to put the veto of England on the acceptance of the Belgian Crown by the Duke of Nemours, and to insist on the withdrawal of the French army. Talleyrand had furtively hinted to Prussia a partition of Belgium, anticipating, it would seem, by some forty years the famous draught treaty of M. Benedetti. Antwerp was to be made a free port by way of a sop to the jealousy of England. Thereupon Lord Palmerston demanded the instant evacuation of Belgian ter-

ritory by the French troops. The liberating army was withdrawn, and Louis Philippe declined the Crown for his son. Its subsequent acceptance by Prince Leopold was only the beginning of difficulties of another kind. The frontier question, the fortresses, the Scheldt dues, and the distribution of the public debt were stoutly contested by the representatives of Holland and Belgium at the protracted Conference of London, and cost M. Van Weyer immense labour and fatigue. All night long he was drawing up his case for the Conference; all day long he was defending it in person; he was hurrying to and fro from London to Brussels and back again, ever in the breach and ever in the front, one day in Downing Street, another in the Congress, ubiquitous and indefatigable with voice and pen, employing all the resources of the advocate, the orator, the publicist, and occasionally even the pamphleteer. The result belongs to history; and if it was not entirely satisfactory to Belgium, or perhaps (in the matter of Luxembourg) to the future interests of Europe, it was satisfactory beyond hope or expectation at the time, and it enabled Leopold to accept the crown without loss of dignity, and to transmit it to his son in peace and security. The account in these volumes of the final ratification of the treaty is one of the most interesting and instructive pages in diplomatic history; we have not space to dwell upon it here. The peace of Europe was saved; the new kingdom was established on that basis of neutrality and independence which its own prudence and prosperity, and the good will it has fairly won all round, have ever since preserved.

The firmness and high spirit with which M. Van de Weyer asserted the rights of his country against all assaults and intrigues were heartily acknowledged by friends and adversaries alike. The Prince of Orange, Talleyrand, William IV., Lord Aberdeen, the Duke of Wellington, Lord Grey, Lord Palmerston, Louis Philippe, all bore willing testimony to the tact and skill of the diplomatist; and in English society it was not only the successful diplomatist that found admirers, but the wit, the philosopher, the scholar, and the high-bred, kindly gentleman that found himself at home among a host of friends. To King Leopold he was not only a trusted servant and valued Minister, but an intimate counsellor and familiar friend. In 1836 he was requested to represent the King at the marriage of his nephew, Prince Ferdinand, to Queen Donna Maria at Lisbon; and four years later he was chosen by the Portuguese Government as arbitrator, with the consent of King Leopold, in a matter of disputed claims between the Governments of Portugal and England, and received the cordial thanks of the British Government for the able and impartial manner in which he had fulfilled a delicate task. Again in 1840 he was requested to act as mediator between the Governments of France and England after the famous treaty of July and the subsequent war in Syria, and in 1847 he acted in a similar capacity and with the same success between the Governments of Spain and Great Britain after the dismissal of Sir Henry Bulwer from Madrid. In fact, whenever any difficulty occurred in European affairs M. Van de Weyer was sure to be called in; such was the reputation he had acquired for that perfect quality in a negotiator, the mingled suavity of manner and strength of purpose which disarms rather than defeats resistance, and conciliates rather than conquers. In the summer of 1845 he was summoned to Brussels to form a Cabinet; in the following spring he resigned office in consequence of a disagreement among his Catholic colleagues on a Middle Class Education Bill. Excepting the interval of these few months, M. Van de Weyer may be said to have resided in England as Minister Plenipotentiary from 1839 to 1867, when, by the urgent advice of his physicians, he asked and obtained his Sovereign's permission to retire from public life. Although a Belgian patriot to the core (as was shown by his stirring pamphlet on the defence of Antwerp, in reply to Mr. Cobden), and proud of the ancient municipal liberties and the civic virtues of his countrymen, we may presume to count him as something more than an adopted Englishman. In public and private life he was always distinguished by those qualities of mind and heart, and by those sympathies and predilections, which we are accustomed to associate with the English character. At the anniversary dinner of the Royal Geological Society in 1849, under the presidency of Sir Charles Lyell, M. Van de Weyer replied to the toast of "the Belgian geologists," and on that occasion the late Sir Robert Peel publicly congratulated the Belgian nation on being so admirably represented in England. In 1850, at the annual dinner of the Royal Literary Fund, Judge Talfourd proposed the health of the President designate for the following year, M. Van de Weyer, as one whose "better half is English, and who has for years been an ornament of our society." And when his own turn came to fill the chair, M. Van de Weyer seized the opportunity of paying homage in graceful and feeling terms to that profession of the pen to which he said he owed his own position in the world, and expressed his gratitude to English statesmen and writers for the support they had always given to Belgian nationality and independence. No Englishman could have delivered a more patriotic, or, let us say, a more truly English, speech than that which M. Van de Weyer delivered in 1857, in the character of a Berkshire landlord and Chairman of the annual dinner of the East Berks Agricultural Association. It was in the crisis of the Indian mutiny, and he depicted in glowing language the heroism of Havelock and his comrades, and appealed to his hearers to unite heart and hand in defending the cause of British civilization in India.

"Calm is life's crown," sings the poet; and the calm which has crowned the brilliant career of this founder of the Belgian kingdom, after the stormy conflicts of his early manhood and the

incessant labours of his later years, is that of ample leisure for those intellectual recreations which were once a refuge from the tumult of affairs and a solace amidst public agitations, and are now the charm and the delight of a philosophic moralist, whom his biographer compares for a moment with St. Evremond, but only to point the happy contrast of two epochs and two destinies.

MORRIS'S HISTORICAL OUTLINES OF ENGLISH ACCIDENCE.\*

WE have several philological books before us, some of which, if we strictly followed the order in which they have made their way to us, would be entitled to an earlier notice than this of Dr. Morris. But we cannot resist the temptation of bringing before our readers as soon as may be a book whose value we think we do not exaggerate when we say that it makes an era in the study of the English tongue. We have at last an historical grammar of the English language which really recognizes what the English language is. It is the first book of the kind which fully grasps the fact that the English language from its earliest to its latest stages is one language, with an unbroken history, and an unbroken personal being. This is the sort of thing for which we have long been looking, and we have found it at last. Dr. Morris does us the honour to acknowledge us as fellow-labourers in his work, and to give us credit for having done something to guide the public mind on this matter, perhaps even to guide the mind of Dr. Morris himself:—

By not regarding the earlier stages of our language as *English*, all the necessary helps to a rational treatment of its grammatical forms and idioms have been cast aside. The *Saturday Review* has very rightly raised its voice rather loudly against the absurdity of such a view, and has properly insisted upon the right of all periods to be designated as *English*,—the very oldest term for our language, and one that is identified with its earliest history and with the very best writers of all its periods, from Alfred the Great down to the present time. This outcry against an absurd nomenclature has been productive of good results, as it is seen in the growing tendency that manifests itself nowadys to study the older stages of English, for the sake of the light they throw upon its later and more modern periods.

We never saw a more striking proof than Dr. Morris's book that the fight which we have been fighting, as some may think for a mere name, has really been a fight, not for a name but for a thing. We here for the first time, in any work of a moderate compass, get the true history of the English language, its real relations to other languages, set forth in a clear and scientific manner. Here are none of the usual confusions and misconceptions; there is nothing of the lingering notion that the tongue of a people who have settled in Britain must have something to do with the Britons and their tongue—nothing of the difficulty of grasping the idea that a tongue may be Teutonic without having any special connexion with High German—nothing of the strange unwillingness to acknowledge that the English tongue could be English until its English purity had been modified, or even corrupted, by foreign elements. We are almost ashamed to say that no trace of any of these confusions is to be found in Dr. Morris's book, because we are sure that, if they ever affected his mind, all trace of them has long ago passed away from it. Still, as we cannot lay our hand on any other book of its class which is not more or less affected by these confusions, it is not needless to say that in Dr. Morris's grammar they find no place whatever. When we read his accurate and scientific account of the origin of the English tongue and of its relations to other tongues, the main thing that strikes us is, how clear, how simple, the whole thing is, how incomparably clearer and simpler than the mass of confusion and contradictions which commonly takes its place in books of the kind. The only fault that we have to find is one that Dr. Morris himself hopes to remedy. His present book is not quite a book for beginners. He says:—“I have endeavoured to write a work that can be profitably used by students or by the upper forms in our public schools; a very elementary book formed no part of my plan.” Dr. Morris's book is admirably suited for its own object, and it fills a void which we have long wanted to see filled. But a purely elementary book, a book for those who know absolutely nothing of the matter till they begin it, is at least as much wanted. Dr. Morris's next sentence is therefore a great comfort to us, when he says, “I hope to have leisure to write a more elementary work than the present one.” Dr. Morris, in his first chapter, gives us in proper form the relations of English to other Teutonic languages, of the Teutonic languages to other Aryan languages, and of the Aryan languages, as inflected tongues, to those which are monosyllabic and agglutinative. The only fault we should find with his arrangement is that he goes backward from Teutonic to Aryan, instead of going forward from Aryan to Teutonic. In these matters clearness is the first point, and the strictly genealogical method, to use Dr. Morris's own words, is surely the clearest of all. And perhaps we may be inclined to throw some doubt on one question of Dr. Morris's where he says:—

The *Teutones* were a German tribe conquered by Marius; hence the terms *Teutonicus* and *Theoticus* were subsequently applied to all German-speaking people.

It would perhaps be safer not to rule, paradoxical as it sounds, that the *Teutones* were Teutonic. At all events, it seems likely

that the word *Teutonicus* came into use as a piece of classical ornament. The old Latin name for the German language is *Lingua Thiotica*, a name which was gradually supplanted by *Teutonica*, which was doubtless adopted under the belief that it was a more classical form of the same name. The odd thing is that, in at least one English document of the eighth century, the decrees of the Synod of Celchyth (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 460), *Teutonica* is used in the sense of *English*, at a time when the word was certainly not in prevalent use in Germany. The fact is perhaps accounted for by its being the Roman Legates who are writing. They might think that *Teutonica* sounded better than either *Anglice* or *Saxonice*, and we do not remember any instance of *Thioticus* being used in England at any time.

But it is comforting to find the Teutonic dialects arranged under the three groups of Low German, Scandinavian, and High German, and in the Low German division to find Gothic at one end and English at the other. Then, after pointing out the chief phonetic differences between English and modern German, Dr. Morris adds, “Not only English, but all the remaining members of the Low German family, as well as the Scandinavian dialects, are thus distinguished from High German.” If all makers of English grammars had known how to put forth plain truths in this plain way, we should not, whenever the Teutonic character of the English people and their language is insisted on, have been met by the usual confused babble about the wide differences between Englishmen and (High) Germans.

Dr. Morris then goes on to distinguish the changes of sounds arising from what Professor Müller calls “phonetic decay” from the permutation of sounds under Grimm's Law. In these last we can commonly see the reason of the change, which it is less easy to see in the case of the permutations under Grimm's Law. We can see why, both in our own and in other languages, men have loved to drop harsh sounds, and to make long words shorter. But we at least cannot see why, where a Greek says *d*, a Low German says *t*, and a High German *z*. We may think that we see indications that the two processes were in their origin the same, but we cannot get beyond guesses. We are quite satisfied in admitting with Dr. Morris that the one class of changes are, as far as we are concerned, fixed and arbitrary, while of the other class we can trace the history and see the reason. But the difference between the two kinds of change should always be borne in mind, as it is not borne in mind by those who use the words “derive” and “derivation” in a reckless way, sometimes deriving a man from his brother or cousin, and sometimes from himself at an earlier stage of life. Dr. Morris then goes on with a most clear and accurate sketch of the history of the English language, putting forth the plain truths which only need to be put forth more simply, tersely, and fully than we ever saw them put forth before. He here points out the difference between these two modes of changes which affect the substance of the language itself, and the various infusions which have made their way into its vocabulary, from the few Latin and British words which were picked up by the first conquerors to the last importation from French, Chinese, Turkish, or American Indian. For the benefit of people who either derive English from German or think that other people so derive it, it may be as well to add that modern High-German is one of the sources from which we have in this way borrowed most sparingly. Dr. Morris might however have increased his German list somewhat. “Halt,” in the military use, is really “derived from the German” *halten*, of which *hold* is the English cognate. And he might have added one word which we have borrowed from modern Germany, and have shown in the process of borrowing that we had not learned our Grimm's Law. We have adopted *Wasserscheide* in the form of *watershed*, while, according to all analogy, it should have been *watersheat*. Such words again as *fatherland* and *one-sided* are distinctly of modern German origin; but they are perhaps rather to be called adaptations or translations than cases of actual borrowing. Nor do we quite accept Dr. Morris's statement that “what is usually designated the Latin of the *First period* consists of words that have had no influence on the language itself, but are only to be found in names of places, as *castra*.” By “Latin of the *First period*” Dr. Morris means the few Latin words which were picked up by the English conquerors in the very process of conquest, as distinguished from the *Second period*—those, namely, which they learned from the Roman missionaries at their conversion to Christianity. But, though the word *castra*, *caester*, no longer exists in our language except as a proper name, there was a time when it was used as an appellative, when the City of the Legions was not yet *Chester*, but was only “a waste *chester*.” But *street* still lives in daily use, and some of the names of objects, plants and the like, which our forefathers called by their native names, just as we do in the like case, but which some people are fond of piling together to show that English is not a Teutonic language, may have come in during the *First period* as well as during the *Second*. And if the Englishmen who were presented to Justinian in company with a Frankish embassy ever got back to their own island, it is not unlikely that they may have brought the word *Casere* with them.

Dr. Morris then goes on to refute the fallacies of those writers who go heaping together collections of words out of dictionaries—many of which are in no proper sense words at all, but mere technical forms—to show that our vocabulary is more Romance than Teutonic. On this Dr. Morris remarks:—

Taking the actual number of words from a good English dictionary, the sum total will be over 100,000. Words of classical origin are calculated to be about twice as numerous as pure English words; hence some writers,

\* *Historical Outlines of English Accidence, comprising Chapters on the History and Development of the Language, and on Word-Formation.* By the Rev. Richard Morris, LL.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1872.

who have only considered the constituent parts of our *vocabulary*, have come to the conclusion that English is not only a mixed or composite, but also a Romance language. They have, however, overlooked the fact that the *grammar* is not mixed or borrowed, but is altogether English.

We must recollect that in ordinary conversation our vocabulary is limited, and that we do not employ more than from three to five thousand words, while our best writers make use of about twice that number.

Now it is possible to carry on conversation, and write numerous sentences, without employing any borrowed terms; but if we endeavour to speak or write without making use of the native element (grammar or vocabulary) we shall find that such a thing is impossible. In our talk, in the works of our greatest writers, the English element greatly preponderates.

Dr. Morris of course does not stop to confute that small sect—for we fancy it is a small one—which will not let even our grammar be our own, but mistakes the immemorial Teutonic plural in *as* for something borrowed from the cognate Latin and French ending. But, though it is perfectly true that our grammar is not borrowed, there can be no doubt that some of the forms which it took in later times were influenced by the Romance language which was spoken alongside of it. This however has perhaps more to do with *syntax* than with *accidence*, and we may perhaps hear something about it in the work on the former subject which Dr. Morris seems to promise us. He then goes on to remark:—

The names of the elements and their changes, of the seasons, the heavenly bodies, the divisions of time, the features of natural scenery, the organs of the body, the modes of bodily action and posture, the commonest animals, the words used in earliest childhood, the ordinary terms of traffic, the constituent words in proverbs, the designation of kindred, the simpler emotions of the mind, terms of pleasure, satire, contempt, indignation, invective, and anger, are for the most part unborrowed.

He then goes on to show how completely the words which cannot be done without are wholly Teutonic, while those which can be done without are mainly Romance. We mark that Dr. Morris reckons *church* among the words of Teutonic origin. The following paragraph well points out the real effect of the Norman Conquest upon the English language:—

Before the Norman Conquest the English language showed a tendency to submit an analytical for a synthetical structure, and probably, had there been no Norman invasion, English would have arrived at the same simplification of its grammar as nearly every other nation of the Low German stock has done. The Danish invasion had already in some parts of the country produced this result; but the Norman invasion caused these changes, more or less inherent in all languages, to take place more rapidly and more generally.

Dr. Morris then goes on with the periods of the English language, marking carefully the changes in grammar, the influence of the three chief local dialects, *Northern*, *Midland*, and *Southern*—the last of these being the *Saxon* strictly so called—the gradual infusion of Romance words, and the final development of the *Midland* dialect as the classical English, the *Northern* and *Southern* being for the future condemned to be looked on as specimens of the "naughty English" of Andrew Borde. In fact, Dr. Morris goes through the whole subject of English *accidence* just as to our mind it ought to be gone through. Every branch of the subject, the history of our verbs and nouns, and the specially curious history of our pronouns, is fully worked out. So is the whole doctrine of particles and suffixes, Teutonic and Romance. And, by way of Appendix, we get, among other things, vocabularies showing the real extent of the Celtic, Latin, and Scandinavian infusions into our language, and, more curious than all, that not very small class of words, originally Teutonic, but which have come into English in a Romance form. Such are *herald*, *marshal*, and a good many others; the most curious of all being *where*, as in *wise* and *guise*, *ward* and *guard*, we have the same word both in its original form and in its foreign dress. In Dr. Morris's grammar we not only may learn something from every page, but the whole is put together in regular and scientific order. When we read the full and clear accounts in his text and in his Appendix of the nature of strong and weak verbs, we do indeed seem to be removed by many generations from the days, which we daresay have in some places not yet passed away, when all that English children were taught was that certain English verbs were "irregular."

#### RUSSIAN LIFE.\*

THERE is very little pretension to book-making in Mr. Barry's *Ivan at Home*. It is made up in fact of a series of disorderly jottings, often without any special interest, and generally without any literary form. The author seems to have emptied some diary or notebook of its contents with no great perception of the difference of value between one fact and another. He has little sense of humour, and his funny stories are, as a rule, his worst. He has still less of the historic or social sympathy which would enable him to enter into the strange mediæval life into which he found himself plunged. Throughout he is simply a shrewd man of business, proud of his English good sense, and amusingly unconscious of his English prejudices, but judging everything steadily from an English point of view. On the old Russia which is passing away he looks with an utter absence of comprehension or sympathy, while language almost fails him to express his admiration of the new Russia which is springing up under the reforming hand of Czar Alexander. Of the Emperor's reforms, indeed, in themselves, it is difficult even for one who views

\* *Ivan at Home; or, Pictures of Russian Life.* By Herbert Barry, Author of "Russia in 1870," &c. &c. London: The Publishing Company, Limited. 1872.

them at a greater distance than Mr. Barry to speak without enthusiasm. No change so mighty has been wrought in Russia since the days of Peter the Great. It is not merely that greater liberty has been given to the press, that political discussion is allowed a far wider range than of old, that travelling within the Empire has been freed from the hindrance of passports, and internal communication facilitated by the improvement of roads; that the protective system, though still adhered to, has been lightened; that the finances have been brought to a sound balance, and the civil service partially reformed, or that the six hundred miles of railway which existed ten years ago have now grown to nearly ten thousand. It is that, with the emancipation of the serfs, and the growth of commerce consequent on these improvements, the whole conditions of social life have been revolutionized. "Until the year 1861," says Mr. Barry very truly, "there were only two classes of people in the Czar's dominions, nobles and serfs. Now there are four—noblemen, merchants, shopkeepers, and peasants." Of the two orders which specially represent old Russia, the noble has been quickened into a new energy by the new position in which he has been placed by serf-emancipation, while the Church will soon feel the impulse given to it by the abolition of the hereditary character of the priesthood. But it is the rise of a middle class which has necessitated the great reforms undertaken by the Emperor in public administration and justice. A "new law with its simple code, oral instead of written practice, trial by jury, irremovable judges elected by the supreme power instead of by the local nobility," is perhaps the greatest of Alexander's gifts to his people. But reforms are often so pretty on paper and so miserable in practice, that we are glad to have from Mr. Barry the evidence of a really shrewd looker-on to the substantial good wrought by the recent changes. He has, in fact, lived in the country, and this gives his book, tedious and uninteresting as it often is, a very different value from the fly-away sketches to which we have been treated in works like Mr. Dixon's. The "old judge," Roman Romanovitch, with "his left hand feeling in his pocket for that which the right hoped to put into it," seems to have been a personal acquaintance. His pay was some forty pounds a-year, "but then he had the power of deporting people to Siberia, and that was a valuable privilege in a money-making country." It was a privilege which had at any rate its value for Roman Romanovitch:—

The fact was that Roman Romanovitch liked good living and playing at cards, so his *income*, which was not so very small, went in this way rather than in adorning his person; and besides, out of his forty pounds a year he was expected to keep a horse and droschky; for as chief judge of the town, his wife could not be supposed to go on foot when she went out for an airing.

His wife dressed well, and in the afternoon always appeared in silks and satin, and moreover, had some rather handsome jewels.

The judge's house was fairly furnished, as upon all his own and his wife's name-days any little articles that they might have dropped a hint they wanted to make their castle comfortable would be surely presented by one or other of the town tradesmen, particularly by any of them who were of a litigious disposition.

Roman Romanovitch was a jolly fellow in his house, and could eat, and drink, and have his joke with every one; and no wonder, for his wine-cellar was much better stocked than the neighbouring "Barrin's," although the latter had a good estate of some twenty thousand acres, and the judge could always boast that he never owed anybody a copeck. Which was true in one way, because all his creditors lived in his own town, and in the case of a disputed account the judge could not be expected to commit such an absurdity as deciding against himself.

The thirty thousand statutes which lay before Roman Romanovitch in ponderous volumes formed, of course, an effectual barrier against any attempt at getting fair play or justice; yet the introduction of a simpler code would have been of little avail but for the two changes which supplemented it—the substitution of oral for written evidence, and, above all, an immense increase in the pay of the judge himself. Instead of forty pounds, Roman's successor received five hundred, and the whole system of peculation fell at once to the ground. At first the *moujiks* hardly understood how cases could be heard without a bribe, or decided in a few days instead of as many years, or why the applicants for justice were not sworn at and bullied as they used to be. But these are changes that people are only too glad to get accustomed to, and we will take Mr. Barry's word for it that in his judicial changes the Emperor has conferred an incalculable boon upon his people.

The main interest of Mr. Barry's book, however, lies in the insight which it gives into the industrial life of Russia. The mineral riches and undeveloped coal-fields of this vast country are in fact the greatest of her future resources. A drive through the low hills of the Ural range, from the gigantic mountain of magnetic iron to the very edge of the steppe, takes the traveller over a region unsurpassed in the amount and variety of its mineral wealth. "Here are gold, copper, lead, iron in masses; forests in abundance to supply the necessary fuel for the successful working of these minerals; labour sufficient for all purposes; all means and appliances ready at hand; the whole only waiting until a little more activity is instilled into the Russian character"; and, we may add, until the foolish administrative restrictions are removed which now hamper industrial enterprise. Mr. Barry hardly exaggerates in his statement that, were the fetters of the bureaucracy once shaken off, the gold mines of Russia would equal in value those of Australia. As yet, however, mining is conducted in a somewhat primitive way. The iron ore is extracted from shallow pits of the same sort as those which are familiar to us in Sussex and the Forest of Dean. On the other hand, the works are of immense extent. Those with which Mr. Barry was connected seem to have been part of "a vast estate

exceeding a million and a-half of acres, together with forty-five villages, and about sixty thousand inhabitants. On this estate were erected twenty-five large works for the production and manufacture of different metals. The revenue derived from this source yielded a princely income." Of the freaks of the great mine-owners, or Barrins, we get, of course, very amusing accounts. It is characteristic of Russia that a "Barrin" usually combined Eastern prodigacy and feudal pride with modern extravagance, and that while he sent his shirts to be washed at Paris, he ordered a harem ready-made from Constantinople, and quietly put mutinous peasants into his blast-furnaces. To express his dissatisfaction at the *dénouement* of a play which had been acted in his private theatre, where the heroine in his opinion had been married to the wrong person, one of those mine-owners stopped the performance, sent for the village priest, and forced the hero and heroine to be actually joined together in matrimony. Extravagances of this sort have been recently checked by the emancipation of the serfs and the stricter justice of the present Emperor; but there is still something distinctively Russian in the character and position of the miners themselves. As a class they stand wholly apart from the agricultural peasantry, untouched by the common village system, and of course unaffected by the recent measure of emancipation:—

On the emancipation of the serfs, in 1861, it was only the ordinary mujiks who received land from their late proprietors. The "mistarovoys," or workmen attached to all the great works, were not regarded in the same light, and the majority of those attached to the works in the centre of Russia are without land. I can mention one circumstance to prove the oddness of the idea held by some of the serfs upon this question. A proprietor of one of the largest of these works at the time of the emancipation offered to let any of his workmen have land on the same terms as the other mujiks, but only the men from one of his twelve zavods accepted this liberal offer.

The workmen received their garden-ground to the extent of one deciatine, but did not participate in the agricultural land.

They have no voice in the communal questions of division of the land, and do not take much interest in the affairs of the village generally. In consequence of having no "obrok" to pay for the land, they, too, are free to go "abroad" to search for work.

As a workman the Russian artisan is excellent. Inferior to the English workman in actual physical strength, and unable to equal him in the quantity of work done, he has much of the Oriental aptitude for mechanical imitation, and can reproduce exactly any model given him, "from a padlock to a watch." There, as here, drink is the workman's most terrible foe; while the strife between employer and employee seems even more constant and virulent in Russia than at home. The Russian Trade Unions have one distinct advantage over their English rivals; by an old statute every proprietor is obliged to maintain his workpeople, whether they are employed or not; and this law, were it strictly enforced, would leave the master absolutely at his men's mercy. But, as a rule, the contest is fought out in the common way, though the causes of a Russian strike are usually no difficult calculations as to rise and fall in price, nor any desire to reduce the hours of labour, but simply a longing for an occasional holiday and a greater proportion of drink.

It is curious to see how these problems of European society stand face to face in Russia with the picturesque social phenomena of the East. We pass from a miners' strike to an interview with the ambassador from Bokhara, hugging the golden ewer which he is carrying as a present to the Czar. The English engineer on board the steamboat yells his "ease'r" and "stop her" over the heads of devout Tartars who have spread their prayer carpet on its deck, and are kneeling with their faces towards the setting sun. At the landing place at Kazan all the apple-dealers are followers of the Prophet, and swindle their Christian customers with true Moslem relish. The very cargoes of the barges on the Volga are as great a medley as the Empire itself:—

As every one knows, the Oka discharges itself into the Volga, so, bidding our friends good-bye, not forgetting the great man, we took the ship's boat, and were rowed into the latter river, noticing on the way the wonderful variety of the various merchandise with which the countless number of barges we passed were loaded.

We saw iron from Siberia, tea from China, cotton from Bokhara, carpets from Persia, petroleum from the Caucasus, salt from the Eastern steppes, corn from Podolia, herrings from Astrakan, samovars from Tula, grindstones from the Oural mountains; in fact, a collection of articles, Eastern and Western, much too numerous to mention, for Nijny Novgorod is the point where, for transport purposes, Europe meet Asia.

If ethnographical variety, indeed, could produce richness of national life, Russia would be the wealthiest nation in this way in the world. In the museum at Moscow examples of all the peoples who own the sway of the Czar have been industriously collected together; they begin with an Esquimaux, and end with a copper-coloured fire-worshipper. Hardly less striking than the contrast between the East and the West is the contrast between the present and the past, or again between the busy life of the great mining factories which Mr. Barry describes and the silence of the vast forests which surround them. The readers of the great Russian novelist will remember the weird power with which he has transferred to his pages the stillness and mystery of those endless woods of dreary pines, stretching for hundreds of miles without a break, save the little clearing in which rises the hut of the bee-keeper, and swept by fires which traverse provinces in their course. "The last one of great importance," says Mr. Barry, "was in 1869, which commencing in the government of Tver, spread until it reached nearly to Wilna, in the centre of Poland." With the same sharp sense of contrast we pass from the modern railway to the Russian Fair. In these great centres of

retail trade all is still mediæval; the medley of goods and peoples is just such as one might have met with in the streets of Troyes six hundred years ago. English beer and French gloves jostle with the shawls and jewels of Khiva and Bokhara, the broken Tchinovnik elbows the blackleg Jew from Poland, the Siberian gold-dealer, the Tartar merchant in his slippers and embroidered skull-cap. Of the many strangers only one seems to be regarded with jealousy and even aversion. "The Russian people," says Mr. Barry emphatically, "do not love the Germans," and yet the Germans are everywhere in Russia:—

In the capital the majority of the large shopkeepers are Germans, whilst in the few other large towns in the Empire many Germans are engaged in trade.

At St. Petersburg, by far the wealthiest bankers, merchants, and brokers are Germans, and many more are of German origin. Commencing from the time of Catherine, the English for many years kept the majority of the trade in their hands; they have been, however, quite distanced by the Germans, and the English are now comparatively nowhere.

But it is in the country that these industrious and frugal people have set an example to the Russian mujik, of which I am sorry to say he has not taken advantage.

Scattered here and there over the Empire are German colonies; some of them, established many years ago upon land given to them by the Crown, have gradually grown into great importance. In several of them manufactures have sprung up, and generally they are industrious and prosperous.

It is quite curious in passing through such a colony to notice the nice houses, clean streets, well-kept fields, everything after the German type, and quite different from the Russian-owned property which it may join. In fact, there is Germany in the middle of Russia.

The hatred is most intense among the peasant class. The memories of serfdom are still fresh and rankling, and to the serf the German means simply the foreign steward who ground his life's blood out of him to provide for the demands of the prodigal noblesse. In the country fair the discovery that a trader is a German is at once fatal to his prospects of finding a customer among the mujiks, but the intensity of the general feeling will only be fully revealed when political circumstances have arrayed, as it seems probable some day must happen, the Teuton against the Russ. Glimpses like these of the actual life and feeling of the common peasant and artisan give Mr. Barry's book, under its somewhat trivial guise, a real value. As yet Russia has been seen through a purely political atmosphere, and the tone of its aristocracy, which is either by birth or fashion German, has passed for the tone of the nation at large. But it is plain that military and bureaucratic Russia is yielding fast to the new people which the changes of the last twenty years have really created. We are grateful to a book like this which introduces us not to the salons of St. Petersburg, but to the hut of the mujik and the forge of the miner. Henceforth the life and feelings of the peasant and the artisan will have to be taken account of in giving any estimate of the probable future of Russia.

#### ESSAYS ON CATHEDRALS.\*

PEOPLE who shake their heads about Cathedrals, and wonder how much longer the age will suffer them to go on, must be a little taken aback by a volume like this of vigorous and practical papers on the future which lies open before them. The names of the writers, not all of them members of Chapters, the interest which they show in the subject, the spirit, conviction, and hope which mark the Essays, and the breadth and sound sense with which they are for the most part written, are not the signs of a failing cause. So far from being in danger, the Cathedrals have the game in their own hands if they choose, and it only depends on their members whether, from being the most suspected, they should not become the strongest, in their hold of popular sympathy, of all the portions of the Church system. No doubt they must work for this; but the means are within their reach.

Dean Howson's share in the work is almost too modest. He confines himself strictly to the task of editor, merely contributing a short introduction, of which the only special feature is the suggestion (a very questionable one) of the expediency of an Executive Commission to co-operate with Chapters in the work of reform. Church Commissions have hitherto proved very disappointing machines, and the wish for one seems to us to betray an unwise, though not unnatural, impatience on the part of energetic and hopeful reformers to stir up the more backward of the Chapters by some external agency. Our own belief is that the most trustworthy of such agencies is the increasing pressure of public opinion and conscience, and that an "Executive Commission," which in the long run practically means some one active member, or it may be a clever and well-informed, but not always friendly, secretary, is likely to deaden the sense of responsibility in bodies which, if they exist at all, ought, with such assistance as they may very reasonably count upon from their Visitors, and if necessary from Parliament, to be their own reformers. If we cannot trust the Chapters to improve without a Commission, a Commission in which they are sure, rightly or wrongly, to see a natural enemy will, we are afraid, be made the excuse for a suspicious and barren conservatism. We cannot help wishing that the Dean of Chester, instead of countenancing the demand for a Commission, had told us more at length how he has introduced new life and usefulness in one of the least favourably circumstanced of capitular organizations.

The Essays cover a good deal of ground. The history of

\* *Essays on Cathedrals.* By various Writers. Edited by the Dean of Chester. London: John Murray. 1872.

the Cathedral idea is the subject of a paper by a writer who has more than any one else seen the deep and pregnant connexion of English national history with English national religion, and who has studied it with the insight and with the industry of genius, Mr. E. A. Freeman. That this idea is not to be regarded as a thing of the past, a device of former ages to meet their own wants, but antiquated now, and incapable of adequately fulfilling any useful purpose in our own, is brought out from various points of view in the other papers which form the bulk of the volume. In two very interesting essays the Bishop of Carlisle and Canon Norris relate their experience and the lessons which it has respectively taught them about actual cathedral work—the one in the post which he so ably filled as Dean of Ely, and the other as Canon of Bristol. Mr. Beresford Hope writes on the great call and peculiar opportunities of Cathedrals in their missionary aspect; in their exceptional relations to the masses, the crowds both in city and country who are so imperfectly within ordinary Church influences, and of whom so little is known, except that they are sure to flock to Cathedrals where Cathedrals do their duty, that they show deep interest in what goes on, that they are more attentive and behave better than the average of regular congregations, and that they can hear things said to them there which they are not likely to hear elsewhere. Professor Westcott takes another great side of this work, complementary to that which has to do with popular instruction and the awakening of conscience and religious ideas in the multitude—namely, the place of Cathedrals in the system of the Church, as homes and centres of religious study and thought. Sir F. Gore Ouseley, than whom no better authority could be found, discusses their functions as schools of religious music, and their duties in the education of choristers; Mr. Denham, the Master of the Carlisle High School, writes about what are at present the subordinate, but far from unimportant, questions connected with Cathedral grammar schools. Two canons of Lincoln, Chancellor Maseingberd and Mr. Venables, contribute to the collection; the first a paper on Cathedral Reform generally, its history and prospects; the second, an interesting sketch of the architectural peculiarities and changes of our English Cathedrals. The Dean of Cashel writes about Irish Cathedrals, and Mr. Stewart Perowne of Llandaff about Welsh ones. Lastly, Dr. Benson of Wellington College takes the exceedingly important, and practically very difficult subject of the relation of the Chapter to the Bishop; a point on which nothing can be more clear and attractive than the theory, and nothing more likely, under our present circumstances, to prove full of embarrassment than the working.

Dr. Benson's learned Essay, illustrated by Mr. Freeman's general historical review, supplies the true account of the original ideal of a Cathedral Chapter, its intended purpose, and its natural and primary functions. It was essentially connected with the Bishop, and in its relation to him as his council lay its original meaning. Neither the maintenance of divine service in the chief church of the diocese, nor the guardianship of its fabric, nor the possession of property as a great Church corporation, nor the conduct of theological education, were the first and essential functions of Chapters. The Chapters were primarily and in their specific character the Bishop's council, "diocesis Senatus"; and as Dr. Benson observes, "the most splendid relic of the institution—it is nothing more"—is still to be seen in the Roman College of Cardinals. They have preserved, as he says, like their "Papa," "an ancient name and ancient activity," which were once to be found in every diocese. And with this view of the institution a whole body of ecclesiastical law arose, by which it was governed. The statutes of each Chapter, varying, as they did, indefinitely in detail, were yet not, as is often supposed, the one rule by which each Cathedral was governed. They were, Dr. Benson reminds us, in no respect *privilegia*: "they were but a fragment of a powerful and well understood system of law—*jus commune*—which existed throughout Europe; which statutes framed for particular Cathedrals could not contravene, and could modify only in some particular." Out of this *conclavicular* idea of the Chapters, the same in substance throughout Western Europe, grew the various constitutional axioms, rules, understandings, by which their action was determined and their relations defined; and Dr. Benson illustrates in detail, from the history and records of Lincoln, how this *conclavicular* idea was in fact realized; how it was assumed, appealed to, and turned to account by bishops who understood its true bearings and value in the government of their diocese; how long the idea lingered; from what causes it dropped into the background and was forgotten; and how it has been attempted to be revived. And it is in the direction of a further and more general return to this original understanding of the meaning of capitular institutions and of their relation to the Bishop that his Essay points. There is no doubt much to be said for this view, that as the Chapters were first created to be the Bishop's council, and to serve in close connexion with the Bishop, and in subordination to him, so the first thing to be sought by reformers is to bring them back to this original function, and to make it the leading and primary feature of the restored action. But it must be remembered that history has its consequences, which are not always to be altered as men wish. It is said that Chapters have departed from their first ideal and purpose; that from being bodies associated to assist the Bishop, and to be his council and assistant, they have grown into self-asserting corporations, independent of him, jealous of his interference, and dissociating themselves from his work. And it is urged that they ought to be brought back by vigorous and stringent legislation to their original use, from which, under bad influences and to their discredit, they have slipped

away. But it is to be remembered that if Chapters have ceased to be the Bishop's council, it is because the Bishop also has changed his position. He ceased to live with them, and in many cases even to reside in the same place; he did not care to have them as his counsellors, and left them to themselves, while he chose his own advisers. The divorce between Bishop and Chapter has been quite as much the Bishop's doing as the Chapter's. And the result has been that the Chapter naturally became more and more an independent body, learning to prize its independence, finding new objects and functions, and claiming to do in its own way what it had come to consider its proper work. Dr. Benson's Essay, and his historical sketch of the fortunes of the Lincoln Chapter, show that if the original *conclavicular* idea of the Chapter has been widely departed from, this result has been owing to general causes, in which the instinct and policy of the Chapter to detach itself from connexion with the Bishop, and to release itself from his control, were but very partial factors. These general causes, many and various in character, have in the course of ages remoulded the institution, and it is with the institution as it now exists, with its functions, its capacities, and its interests, that we must deal at present. To attempt to subordinate Chapters to episcopal necessities and uses, and to destroy the independent position which the course of events has given them, in order to make them closer imitations of their original form, and to render them more serviceable instruments in the hands of the Bishops, would be as unreasonable and mischievous as we are sure it would be vain. That they may be of great assistance to the Bishops, and that really it rests very much with the Bishops to seek and to gain their co-operation, we have no doubt. But if their reason for existing now is only that which no doubt originally called them into existence, that they should be the Bishop's council, the reason seems an insufficient one.

The truth is, that they have grown into a place of their own, with special work, opportunities, and objects; and it is by this standard, whether they fill this place adequately and discharge its obligations, and not by reference to the functions which the earliest Chapters had to perform, that the case of Cathedral institutions must be judged. Their real, at least their paramount, use seems to lie in the two directions indicated in the papers of Mr. Beresford Hope and Dr. Westcott; in their "missionary aspect," as great centres and schools of preaching, and in their office, as places absolutely unique in our day in their advantages for theological study, religious education, and devotional life. This last view of the subject is perhaps the one which appeals least to popular sympathies. The temper of the day, calling for immediate and visible activity, appreciates services and preaching, but sets less store on the more concentrated and more retired work of thought, reading, and research, and the methodical and deliberate ordering of life. Yet if anything is certain, it is that our society, even our religious society, stands in need in the highest degree of more theological and historical knowledge, of calmer reflection, of less hurried and feverish decisions, of simpler and more frugal ways of living. Dr. Westcott has expressed this with earnestness and force. With one portion of this view we are familiar. The true functions of Cathedrals as places of study and intellectual work have often been insisted on. Dr. Westcott adds to this the important services which they might render both to society and to the Church, by presenting examples of "plain living" united with ready and free hospitality. "It may appear visionary," he says, "to set forward Cathedral bodies as the natural pioneers in an effort towards gaining a simpler and more frugal mode of living than commonly prevails." But he has the boldness, and we think also the wisdom, to remind the members of the Cathedrals that they have the opportunity of bearing a witness which no class needs so much as that which is becoming so powerful, against the worship of riches and the debasing materialism which go along with the "extravagant luxury which is wasting society." "No class," as he reminds us, "is so self-indulgent and luxurious as that of the skilled artisan":—

No class is so likely to grow in importance, and it is idle to hope for any general response from them to exhortations to self-denial till they grow familiar with a higher type of life within their reach, visibly realized by those who deliberately set aside the kind of "pleasures" which as yet they find so attractive.

Such a way of viewing Cathedral institutions seems more sound than one which simply goes back to their ancient and original functions in relation to the Bishop, or than one which looks only to making them of use in the organization and government of a diocese. The common mistake is that of monopolizing for some pressing and popular object powers which were intended for purposes of their own. Cathedral institutions, rightly used, can secure certain ends which nothing else can. It is sheer waste to claim them for other work which could be done, though not perhaps so readily, by other means. And even if their work now does not correspond exactly to the original intention of their creation, it is no objection to a policy which adapts the institutions of one age, modified but not revolutionized, to the real needs of another. In all discussions about Cathedral reform, Dr. Westcott's weighty words should be in the minds of those who, in their impatience at the failures which undoubtedly may be pointed out in the working of Cathedral institutions, are disposed to be jealous of that freedom and leisure without which we cannot hope that from them we may receive those real and valuable contributions to our higher theology which, as much as anything, this age, so busy, so quick, but so hasty and vehement in its conclusions, urgently needs:—

There is a natural tendency in all crises to regard those objects as para-

ment which are of obvious utility; to turn into popular channels alien forces which are capable of diversion; to accumulate upon the points to which common attention is directed all the resources which can be made to minister to ends which are undeniably legitimate. It is easier for the moment to defend an institution by showing that it can serve some good purpose, than by considering what special purpose it may be best made to serve. It is more encouraging to work for a result which is immediate and certain than to prepare the way for one which is remote and unfamiliar. It is more grateful to supply an acknowledged want than to point out the existence of a new one. But endowments are essentially designed to provide for objects which do not appeal equally and at all times to general sympathy. They contemplate services which are wide in their scope, and perhaps only partially recognized. They enable patient labourers to command the means of dealing independently with great problems.

It is necessary to reject any theory of their function as inadequate, however much it may fall in with the satisfaction of urgent needs, which is not essentially specific. And conversely we shall be justified in setting up an ideal standard of their office which may not be capable of speedy realization, if it at once corresponds with the evident design of their foundation, and also answers to actual, if not obtrusive, requirements of the Christian society.

The services of the cathedral are an element—a most important element—of cathedral work, but they do not constitute cathedral work. The cathedral is a part, but it is not the dominating part of the cathedral foundation. Preaching is in no sense more a duty of the members of the Chapter than it is of parish priests. In the cathedrals of the new foundation the Dean and Chapter, with whom rests the entire and joint responsibility for the due fulfilment of the objects of the foundation, are required to provide for the "worshipping of God in their church with hymns and psalms, and continual prayers"; but no part in this service is assigned to them except that of ordinary attendance. A body modelled after the pattern sketched by the late Dean of Canterbury would provide for the performance of such work as well as it can be performed, and yet such a body would be bereft of almost every distinctive feature which marks the constitution of our present foundations.

We must, then, look elsewhere for the "idea" of cathedral foundations, for that vital power by which they have lived through times of apathy and indolence, and by which they may yet minister to the awakened energies of the Church. This is defined very clearly by the statutes of the New Foundation in the outlines there drawn of cathedral work and cathedral life. The work is concentrated in theological study and religious education; the life is shaped by systematic devotion and corporate action. No one will deny that this combination gives a specific character to a cathedral body; no one will deny that there is scope for the beneficent action of a society regulated by these principles in the English Church.

If it be said that this interpretation of one of the chief functions of cathedral bodies is at variance with their history, the answer is plain. It may be at variance with their history hitherto; but is it at variance with their idea, or with the principles on which they are founded? Is the work which has been roughly sketched superfluous or obsolete or impracticable? Is not the interpretation simply a rendering of old forms into the new forms which correspond to them? Is not the work one which is urgently pressing, and capable of being compassed, at least at its outset, by the resources of cathedrals? The peculiar characteristics of the age of transition in which we live bring out the need; and at the same time they are suited to guard public patronage from the action of caprice or favouritism. We can see in some respects more clearly than our predecessors what cathedrals ought to do, and we are better protected than they were against some of the evils which hindered the efficiency of what were supposed to be offices of dignity and repose.

There are, as is only too obvious, many defects and imperfections in the present constitution of Cathedral Chapters. Some of their powers are dormant; others have been enfeebled; there is a vague sense that they have no distinct function, and a consequent haste on the part of their more zealous members to occupy themselves with work which is already assigned to other officers in the Church. But if there be any truth in what has been already said, it can scarcely be questioned that they are able to fulfil a part in connexion with religious thought which no other body can fulfil, and which is essential to the complete well-being of the Christian society.

#### THE STORY OF SIR EDWARD'S WIFE.\*

IT fell to our lot not long ago to review a novel by Mr. Hamilton Marshall, called *Men Were Deceivers Ever*. Mr. Marshall himself expresses an opinion through the mouth of one of his characters that the hero of his present story is "much too clever to write novels. It is women and children," he adds, "that read novels." If this is Mr. Marshall's own opinion, and not a mere dramatic utterance, we can only wonder that he returns so soon to a form of literary art which he so emphatically condemns. Whether that condemnation be just or not is a question on which we do not feel bound to express our opinion; but this at least may be said, that if it is not beneath the dignity of a clever man to write novels, it should certainly not be beneath his dignity to write them well. We therefore fancy that Mr. Marshall might have done well to bestow a little more pains upon his present production. We may indeed say that in some respects he has made a decided improvement. His last story was written in a singularly spasmodic style; it was full of short jerky sentences, and bristled with full stops which occasionally interfered with the grammatical construction of the sentences. The fault has, to a certain extent, disappeared. He is not so sententious in his utterances, and his sentences do not quite so much resemble the cracking of a whip. There are, indeed, plenty of epigrammatic remarks for which Mr. Marshall appears to feel a rather weak paternal affection. To take an example or two, his model hero is reported by his wife to have uttered the following pithy observations, which are intended to illustrate the brilliancy of his wit. "Graham," he says to the stupid young man, "I call spring the profile of the year, summer the full face." In the same page he remarks of an old college friend, "Ross is of a flash-in-the-pan disposition—a hair-trigger and damp powder." We must leave to our readers to judge of the merit of this style of conversation;

\* *The Story of Sir Edward's Wife*. By Hamilton Marshall. London: King & Co. 1872.

whatever may be thought of it, it is obviously Mr. Marshall's own ideal of good writing. He is always trying to dazzle us in his own characters by such little sparkles of wit. Speaking of a letter, he says, with no special provocation, and not because the remark leads up to anything, "I forget now whether it sailed under a sixpenny or under a shilling stamp. For a stamp and address is the rigging of a letter." At first sight one supposes that such a metaphor as this must be very clever; and yet we confess that the more we think of it, the less we see in it. The resemblance between a stamp and rigging vanishes as soon as it is examined; and we come to resent this irrelevant conceit, which only distracts our attention from the letter itself. Occasionally these flowers of speech are even more conspicuously out of place. The virtuous giant has at the catastrophe of the story got the villain by the throat, and his victim naturally gasps out, "You choke me." Whereupon the giant replies, "Do I? Those plants would die that live on foul air." To say nothing of the improbability of a stupid, though good and muscular, young man indulging in this witticism—as we suppose it to be—at the moment, we must confess that it is so sharp as to us to be quite unintelligible. We have turned it over and over, backwards and forwards, and can make no sense of it whatever. Apparently it is intended to intimate that plants which live on foul air would die in pure air; but then we do not see how the allegory applies to the case of a villain who is in danger of dying from absence of air of any kind. Or possibly it is meant that since some plants can live on foul air, a villain can live when he is being choked. The logic is perhaps good enough for the occasion; but we must say that the expression is in this case very inadequate to convey the meaning. On the whole we are inclined to give up the problem, which is not worth very much labour.

We will quote no more of these little artifices of language, which are, we think, not quite so plentiful as in Mr. Marshall's former novel, and which, to our thinking, should be dealt with according to the well-known rule of the critic who advised a young writer to read over his manuscript and rub out whatever he thought to be particularly fine. If Mr. Marshall would excise all his epigrams, his story would be distinctly improved. We have, however, noticed the fault at greater length because it illustrates Mr. Marshall's besetting sin. He has talent, and can be amusing when he is not over-anxious to show how clever he is. But he suffers from a weakness of many youthful novelists; that is, an exaggerated fear of being dull. Now, we admit, or, we should rather say, we assert with all possible emphasis, that dulness is the one unpardonable sin that a writer of novels can commit. No care can be too great to avoid it. But unluckily in this, as in so many other instances, inexperienced people are apt to blunder into the very error which they are most anxious to avoid. To mention nothing else, it is a primary condition of making any story amusing that the situations should be set before us as plainly and intelligibly as possible. If two of the characters are talking, we should know precisely, and, what is more, we should know without trouble, what is the object of each of the interlocutors, what view each takes of the position of the other, and, generally, we should be thoroughly posted up in all that is necessary to a complete understanding of all the bearings of the dialogue. If it is necessary to bear a complicated set of circumstances in our head, and to turn over the pages to refresh our memory as to the precise stage of development of the plot, the writer may be certain that not one in a hundred of his readers will take the necessary trouble to appreciate his points. We should recommend Mr. Marshall to study the writings of Mr. Trollope from this point of view. Mr. Trollope occasionally appears to be, and indeed occasionally is, unduly tiresome in setting before us all the facts on which we are to form a judgment; but the charm of his stories is due in great measure to the thoroughly systematic and business-like way in which he discharges his duty. We are never for a moment puzzled as to the relative position of his characters, and we feel the most absolute confidence that he will never commit an anachronism or leave a thread in his narrative not taken up. It is owing to this pleasant mutual confidence between the author and his readers that Mr. Trollope is able to interest us in a long series of apparently trifling details and a quantity of "says he's" and "says I's," which would be intolerable under any other circumstances. Now Mr. Marshall is a curious example of an utter want of confidence in this respect. He seems to be perpetually afraid that if he attempts to hold our button for a single instant we shall make our escape. He fears to detain us in order to give the most necessary explanations. He supposes us to be so impatient that we will not look on whilst the necessary operations are being carried out to get the machinery into proper working order, and therefore he very mistakenly slurs over all the dry, though necessary, bits of narrative, and tries, according to the customary phrase, to make his pudding entirely of plums. The consequences are most uncomfortable. The story becomes tedious, though short. We never clearly know what his performers are to be at; they are not allowed a breathing space in which to develop their plans or their characters; and the narrative, in the hope of making it more lively, is put into the mouths of several different people, who are themselves perplexed by the intricacies of a plot in which it is no wonder if they succeed in perplexing the reader.

The story involves a mystery, or, indeed, two or three mysteries, which are not fully unravelled till the end. The chief narrator is a virtuous butler, who puzzles himself as to the relations existing between his master and his mistress. From a pure desire to

restore the harmony which ought to prevail, he takes to listening behind doors, acting as a spy upon his fellow-servants, picking up letters that have been dropped, and consulting the pages of blotting-books. This excellent person complains of the deterioration of the modern breed of servants, and thinks that affection is no longer to be bought for money. We must confess that we should regard affection of his type as being dear at any price. Indeed he comes to the conclusion, entirely without foundation as it turns out, that his mistress has committed bigamy, and is undergoing a persecution from her first husband—the supposed first husband turning out, first to be her brother, and ultimately, as we believe, though we are not quite clear, to be only the son of the woman whom she erroneously supposed to be her mother. The virtuous butler is taken into the confidence of another even more virtuous literary person who is staying with the family, and who, from motives of the purest benevolence, encourages him to act as a spy, and occasionally gives him sovereigns to reward his activity. The two, together with a virtuous medical attendant who confides to them various family stories which have come to his knowledge on deathbeds, succeed in making a very pretty mess of a story already sufficiently complicated. A whole series of misunderstandings are crammed together into a short volume. Sir Edward Fask, the hero, is discovered to have been changed at nurse and therefore, not to be the rightful heir to his property; after which it is again discovered that, though he has been changed at nurse, he is the rightful heir all the same. Lady Fask is first supposed to be the daughter of a Mr. Tredway; then it seems that Mr. Tredway only made her pass for his daughter; and finally it seems that she was his daughter after all. A quantity of plate is stolen, and a vast deal of detective ingenuity is displayed about a glove which the thief appears to have left behind; though the glove is carefully concealed from everybody except the virtuous butler and his more virtuous friend aforesaid. First we are led to suppose that the lady's brother, who, however, is not her brother, has stolen it; then that a wicked clergyman has stolen it; then that a maid-servant, who goes mad—and no wonder under such bewildering circumstances—knows all about it; and finally it turns up, we cannot understand why or how, in a portmanteau with which the lady is preparing to elope in company with the wicked clergyman. For some reason, as mysterious as everything else in the story, this discovery leads to a reconciliation of the lady with her husband, and everything leaves off in the customary blaze of glory. In all probability we have made some gross blunders in this account of the most bewildering plot that we ever tried to understand. Our apology must be that there is not the slightest appearance that the story would be worth the pains of unravelling. The most intelligible episode—which is utterly irrelevant to everything else—concerns a selfish elderly gentleman who wishes to marry a lovely and rich young lady. To effect his purpose, he gets up a picnic, and gets his servant to saw through a bridge over a flooded river where he and the lady are on one side, and the rest of the party on the other. We really cannot see why she should marry him even then, though it is eighteen miles round by the nearest bridge. However, the rest of the party assume that this result would be inevitable, and three of them risk their lives in attempting to cross the stream. We presume that they were the best judges; but, to say the truth, this, like most other points of the plot, is to our intelligence hopelessly bewildering. We are content to give it up as a bad joke.

If it be asked why we should have spent so much pains in criticizing what must appear to be a mass of undeniable nonsense, we can only say that, in spite of its palpable absurdities, there is a certain freshness and indication of talent in the novel, which makes us fancy that the writer could do better things if he would condescend to be commonplace for a time.

#### LITTRÉ'S MEDICAL ESSAYS.\*

M. LITTRÉ has bestowed a boon upon literature by gathering together for republication the fruits of his early studies and researches. Even in the occasional and fugitive writings of a scholar so painstaking and exact, and a critic so thoroughly conscientious, there is sufficient value to forbid their passing away with the ephemera of a generation ago. His later labours upon the growth and structure of the French language, and, above all, his colossal Dictionary, now happily approaching completion, have given him so distinctive and advanced a place in the ranks of his native literature as to make the public, it may be, unconscious or forgetful of the toil that he had spent and the results which he had achieved in an earlier and widely separate field of learning. It was in the department of medicine that M. Littré entered upon his career of study, and counted on finding his professional pursuit through life. To this day he has maintained, he tells us, his ardour for medical studies. He has written much upon the subject—periodical papers, articles in dictionaries, monographs on themes like that of the cholera and other epidemics, critical and biographical notices of physicians, with an edition of Hippocrates. For ten years he walked the hospitals of Paris as *externe* and *interne*, in sedulous attendance upon the lectures of M. Rayer, to whose memory he dedicates this second harvest of what he reaped from his early course. Yet to this day he has passed not a single examination, he has no medical title or degree what-

ever, and he is not a physician. For so strange a state of things he gives the reason in the short preface to this volume of essays, which he seeks to excuse as the chat of an old man, aware that he has not many hours left him, and turning a lingering eye upon the past. His father's death, just at the time when he had kept his terms and was preparing himself for examination, threw him upon his own resources, burdened with the charge of his mother, which a brother shared with him. Unable to meet the expense of taking the doctor's degree, and too independent to avail himself of the proffered assistance of friends—his old teacher, Dr. Rayer, and his schoolmate, Hachette the publisher, among the number—he could not, even while making a living by his pen, wholly tear himself away from studies he loved so well. He still followed as a volunteer Dr. Rayer's clinical course at La Charité, working in the laboratory, and, though not practising medicine as a profession, cultivating it as a science. In later years he has, he tells us, found a useful field for his medical knowledge among the villagers in his neighbourhood. It was during these studies that the project of the great Dictionary was formed between him and Hachette, who was not destined to see it finished. Widely distinct as at first sight this, the great work of his life, might be thought, there was, he himself urges while dwelling upon the course of his intellectual growth, no mean value in the exercise which the exact study of medicine gave to his mental powers. Not for worlds would he have foregone that potent and salutary discipline. Morally and intellectually it formed an indispensable element in his general education. Rude and severe as it was, he felt it to be a good and bracing school. In a moral sense its gain lay in the largeness of sympathy which the sight and the treatment of suffering must engender in the soul of the true physician. Intellectually it is well to have witnessed in the anatomical theatre or in the hospital the highest organic laws or forces, both in their direct and reflex operation; to trace the conditions and results of healthy or morbid action, and to define the limits of man's power and skill in his mediation between life and death. In his brief autobiographical notice M. Littré lays down what might be expanded into a whole system of medical philosophy, whilst giving practical proof in his own person of its power to enlarge, to purify, and to strengthen both the intellect and the heart.

The study of medicine at the critical period of M. Littré's career was undergoing a kind of revolution. It had been the fashion to regard the pathology of disease as a series of phenomena having a real existence or *raison d'être*. Fever, cancer, inflammation, or what not, was an entity or substantial something in itself. Between the pathological and the physiological stage of being there was absolutely no connexion, nor was it held possible to bridge over the gulf. Such was the inevitable state of things until physiology began to enter upon its positive phase. With the present century the true method of physiological study made itself felt, and gave a new life to the philosophy of medicine. It became clear that no new or special law was involved in the phenomena of this or that disease. Morbid pathology was seen to be nothing else but physiology under a phase of derangement.

Like most followers of Comte, M. Littré has erred in setting down as an idiosyncrasy of his master an influence which was in reality due to the general tendency of philosophical thought at that period. It was not only in the triple formula which embodied his law of historical development, but in the more general sequence of his speculative ideas, that the founder of Positivism drew from the fountain of Hume. That the metaphysical or *a priori* method of contemplating nature has given way to a philosophy resting upon facts, and that no science is any longer studied as an isolated branch of knowledge apart from its relations to science in general, is far from forming the distinctive or novel glory with which those who call themselves Positivists claim to invest their master and themselves. Long before Comte had proclaimed his new classification of the sciences, the metamorphosis from which was evolved the medical philosophy of our day had been silently passing over the spirit of the earlier or scholastic system of inquiry. To free himself from the spectre of mediæval or even more archaic nosology, there was no need for M. Littré to snatch at Comtism as the sole lamp of truth. To go no further, he might have thought of somewhat having been due to Haller and Bichat. That which from the first enlisted him under the banner of Positivism, and still keeps him in its ranks, was, he assures us, the light thrown upon his special range of study by its simply falling into its true place in the cycle of general movement and illumination. In the hierarchy of the Comtist heavens, physiology, with medicine as its attendant satellite, precedes sociology, and follows after chemistry. From simply seeing its place in the zodiac of the sciences, the student of medicine has henceforth at command all the light he needs. The lower and less complicated sciences, such as chemistry and physiology, will, in accordance with the Comtist formula, supply the needful illumination, which medicine will in turn reflect upon social philosophy. Unmindful of what has been done by Mr. Herbert Spencer and other critics to shake the basis of Comte's classification, as well as to dispute the logical evolution so much insisted on in the so-called Positivist genesis of the sciences, M. Littré seems to regard the authority of his master as the spell which has wrought all the wonders of modern thought. In his treatment of the special subjects comprised in this volume of essays he has nevertheless practically shown how little the most advanced criticism need be coloured by the peculiar tone or diction of what claims to be alone pos-

\* *Medicine et Médecins*. Par E. Littré, de l'Institut et de l'Académie de Médecine. Paris: Didier et C<sup>o</sup>. 1872.

the truth. So far from being distinctively Comtist, his method is simply that of every genuinely inductive reasoner, from Bacon downwards. In the permanence and consistency of natural laws as underlying all sequences and co-existences, there is but the difference of expression to convey the idea of any advance since the days of Aristotle. There are indeed schools of thought or systems of teaching still in existence, of which the central ideas remain at the stage which Positivists stigmatize as the metaphysical, over which the universality of natural law has not yet extended its sway. And here M. Littré does good service by his vigorous and effective vindication of nature. We are, as it happens, enabled just now to see these two schools in marked contrast with each other. The theme of one of our author's most telling essays, the "Demon of Socrates," has been lately made the subject of discussion in a high quarter amongst ourselves. Where Archbishop Manning is disposed to see from the first an opening for an order of forces transcending in kind no less than in degree the agencies now at work in the moral or social world, M. Littré takes his stand throughout upon the absolute identity and permanence of all the conditions of the problem. There can have been nothing, he argues, in the personal constitution or in the surroundings of Socrates which had not its counterpart in the case of men in general and in every age. Whether better or worse, wiser or less wise, than his contemporaries or successors, Socrates was neither more nor less than any other man of his or our day the subject of extra-human or extra-mundane agencies or forces. What was peculiar or abnormal, either in the subjective belief or impressions or in the conduct and life of the Athenian sage, was in no sort due, as the Archbishop thinks likely, to any special Providence surrounding so good and holy a man, or to any voice reaching his ears or conscience from a sphere outside of and above that of common life. It needs to be judged or estimated by no standard higher than that of mental action in general. Under the light of pathology the phenomena, according to M. Littré, admit of but one solution, the same which would be given by every medical expert in our day. The case was simply one of mental derangement. The voice heard by Socrates had no other reality than the objectiveness given by morbid imagination to the subjective workings of the organs of the mind. Antiquity was not sufficiently conversant with the phenomena of morbid psychology to refer these to their rightful cause. Nor is it till within quite recent years that the diagnosis of hallucinations of this kind has been approached with anything like scientific accuracy. Experience has for ages shown the compatibility of these special characteristics with faculties or moral gifts of the highest order, a circumstance which has naturally led to their being confused with the idea of supernatural possession or inspiration. M. Littré cites the case of Tasso, talking in magniloquent language with the genius whom his hallucinations had called up, and of Van Helmont, to whom his own soul appeared one day under the form of a faint flame, and revealed to him the system of medicine which long made a noise in the schools of Europe.

The same subject is continued in a review of M. Lélut's essay upon the *Amulet of Pascal*. Sewed up in his dress, where it was found after his death, Pascal, it is well known, wore a slip of paper containing, besides a general engagement to a change of life and a more complete devotion to God, the words, "Depuis environ dix heures et demie du soir jusques environ minuit et demi, feu," with the date November 23, 1654. This flame it was that he took for a supernatural apparition, urging him to more strenuous progress in the path of Jansenist rigour. A further form of hallucination was the precipice which, from the hour of his narrow escape from drowning in the Seine, he always saw before him, knowing it, however, all the while to be an illusion. The particular form which mental derangement assumes in this or that case is due in the main to the ideas generally prevalent at the time, especially as regards supernatural agencies or powers. These ideas have changed from age to age. They have passed from fetishism through polytheism to monotheism, and in their latest form vary between pantheism and secularism, or nihilism. In the nature of things alone there has been no change, vastly as men have changed in their opinions on the nature of things:—

Il ne virent ni n'entendirent alors rien autre que ce qui se voit et s'entend aujourd'hui; mais ils l'expliquèrent autrement. Cette lente explication des choses est l'histoire même: entre l'idée d'un dard de feu qu'un dieu lance dans des cieux et la connaissance des phénomènes électriques, entre les visions qui montraient les êtres surnaturels et la détermination médicale qui les rapporte à l'état pathologique du cerveau, il y a toutes les phases sociales dont les annales humaines nous offrent le déroulement. C'est une chaîne non interrompue où l'esprit humain arrive de plus en plus près de la connaissance réelle des choses, et le dernier terme a sa raison d'être dans le premier; c'est une élimination où des conceptions de plus en plus nettes remplacent les conceptions anciennes jusqu'au monothéisme lui-même, qui arrive aujourd'hui à la fin de sa phase sociale, et duquel on fait voir, ou, philosophiquement, que la notion de cause première et absolue est inaccessible à l'esprit humain, ou, historiquement, qu'il est le fils des formes religieuses antérieures.

Upon the cognate phenomena of demonology and sorcery, the religious possessions or epidemics of the middle ages, and the table-turnings and spirit-rappings of our own day, M. Littré turns the light of the same scientific pathology, aided by the erudition which his wide and scholarlike reading has supplied. To trace the common ancestry and expose the kindred fallacies of this long series of popular deceptions is with him a task as easy as it is edifying. The morbid analysis which scientific medicine has especially developed of late years blends here with the philosophic

study of life and history. What is at first puzzling, if not alarming, in the reports widely spread abroad of talking and writing spirits, of floating forms, gyrating tables, or luminous apparitions, is stripped of its wonder or its terror when it is shown with how slight variation impostures or delusions of the same kind crop out in the history of mental progress, and with what logical consistency they are to be connected with the same or similar conditions of mental disease. Nor is M. Littré less clear or forcible when he writes upon some more special branch of physiological, or even anatomical, inquiry; as in his review of M. Leuret's admirable *Comparative Anatomy of the Nervous System in its Relation to the Intellect*, continued by M. Gratiot, or that of Professor Rostan's medical theory known as Organicism, with reflections upon scepticism in matters of medicine. In reducing all vital action to properties inherent in organization, what, he asks, has M. Rostan gained beyond a new turn of expression? He has himself indicated its transitory character by pointing to a day of hope when all vital acts will be explained by physico-chemical agency. When indeed is that day of triumph for the pure materialist to come? The hypothesis is itself, as our author shows, illusory, not alone by reason of its violation of the Comtist canon in subjecting a more complex science like biology or physiology to one less complex, such as chemistry or physics, or of its substituting the pursuit of the "why" for the "how," but on what we hold to be the broader and more philosophical ground that it confounds two spheres of phenomena which the mind is wholly unable to grasp in common. It commits philosophy to a sort of squaring the circle by realizing a common measure or conjunct expression in the case of incommensurables. The practical turn which M. Littré is no less successful in giving to his talents is shown in some valuable remarks upon hygiene, as well in its private aspects as in relation to epidemics such as the cholera; upon gunshot and other wounds in war; upon the medical use of electricity, and the medico-legal theory of poisoning, illustrated by historical disquisitions upon the deaths of Alexander the Great, Henry I. of France, and Henrietta of England, sister-in-law of Louis XIV. In a charming criticism upon a well-known episode of *Gil Blas*, the reader may enjoy seeing for once the application of medico-philosophical tests to the creations of fiction. There is something novel and piquant in beholding one of the liveliest and keenest of French wits under the hands of the first and most austere living master of Positivism.

#### FATHER GERARD.\*

(Second Notice.)

IN our previous notice of this volume we confined our attention to the autobiography of Father John Gerard; but the Narrative of the Plot is in some respects even more full of interest than the Life. The Life is only a translation; and partly on that account, though even more because it was originally written in Latin, it is less vividly depicted than the History of the Plot, which is given in the author's exact words. There is of course in both narratives the colouring of one who was deeply interested in all that he tells; but, after deducting as much as can be allowed on the score of the difficulties in which the English Government was placed by the conduct of the Jesuits, and after admitting that the prime cause of all the sufferings of Roman Catholics, at least in Elizabeth's reign, was the foolish and impotent Bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, published in 1570 by Pius V., it is impossible not to award the Jesuits their due meed of praise for heroic submission to suffering for what they considered a good cause, nor again to refuse our tribute of sympathy to men who were condemned frequently without any sufficient evidence to prove the charges upon which they were arraigned. There can be little doubt that Father Gerard would have been executed, if he had been caught, for participation in the plot, or else on some other charge; neither do we see any reason to doubt his often repeated asseverations that he was in entire ignorance of the whole conspiracy.

The main object of the work is to endeavour to exculpate the general body of Roman Catholics from having any share in the plot, and especially to represent the priests as being, with two exceptions, entirely ignorant of the design; these two being bound by the seal of confession not to reveal what they had heard—the one knowing the matter directly, the other in consultation, and both of them having, according to Father Gerard, done what lay in their power to frustrate the whole affair. Father Gerard's own expressions of horror at the wickedness of the means taken to compass what nevertheless he considers a good end are probably genuine representations of his own individual feeling; but they fail to do away with the impression which will remain on the minds of most readers after weighing the whole history, that there were many both amongst the Jesuits and of the laity who would not have stirred a finger to prevent the catastrophe, and who would also have hailed the success of the plot with extravagant delight. Father Gerard does not attempt to conceal the bitterness of the disappointment felt when James, the son of a Catholic mother, succeeded quietly to the throne, and the toleration they had hoped for turned out to be an idle expectation. Indeed, the hopes that the Roman faction entertained of the King's conversion contributed not a little to his quiet succession to the Crown, though perhaps the writer some-

\* *The Condition of Catholics under James I.; Father Gerard's Narrative of the Gunpowder Plot.* Edited, with his Life, by John Morris, Priest of the Society of Jesus. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1871.

what overstates the case when he alleges that James had promised the toleration of their religion to "divers Catholics of note and fame, and priests also who rode forth into Scotland as well to carry the assurance of dutiful affection from all Catholics unto his Majesty, as also to obtain his gracious favour for them and his royal word for confirmation of the same" (p. 24). The bitterness of the persecution which they endured the author ascribes principally to the Puritans, whom he always carefully distinguishes from the Church of England party, whom he calls by the name of Protestants. He speaks also of the severity of the punishments inflicted on Catholics as being intended to be a set-off to gratify the Puritans for the snubbing they received at the King's hands at the Hampton Court Conference. But, though we may perhaps be allowed to demur to the writer's assertion that the plot was "a thing that hath brought more grief to the hearts of Catholics generally in England than ever anything did in all the time of their sufferings" (p. 47), we see no reason to distrust any of the facts of the narrative. And, for ourselves, considering the modus in which they were exasperated by persecutions on the part of the Government, we think it wonderful that a larger number of them were not implicated in the Gunpowder Plot.

The originator of the scheme was Catesby, a recent convert who had been in Essex's rebellion, having obtained a promise of toleration if it should succeed. Percy and Wright had become converts about the same time; and the other two—Winter and Fawkes—had been bred in the Roman faith. Soon afterwards their number was increased to seven by the addition, first, of a younger brother of Wright's, and then by an elder brother of Winter's. The original conspirators had justified themselves by suggesting some doubts in general terms to Father Garnett as to how far, in the case of attacking an enemy, it was right to sacrifice the innocent with the guilty. Garnett satisfied them on this point without understanding the case to which it was intended to apply, but he afterwards became uneasy, and appears to have done his best to suppress any rising amongst his co-religionists. Subsequently five more country gentlemen were admitted into the secret—Rookwood, Grant, Keyes, Tresham, and Sir Everard Digby. Tresham was the brother-in-law of Lord Mounteagle, and appears to us to have been the most likely person to have written the well-known letter which led to the discovery of the plot. The truth on this subject will never now be known for certain; but the author's arguments to prove that Tresham was not the writer appear to us quite inconclusive. The mode in which four of the conspirators were killed and seven sent to the Tower, two more being afterwards added to their number, is matter of history; and Father Gerard's object is to show that these were really the only persons implicated in the plot. A proclamation was, however, issued against three Jesuits—Garnett, Tesimond, and Gerard himself. Garnett was first caught and sent to the Tower, where, by a stratagem of the Lieutenant of the Tower, he was overheard conversing with another Jesuit, and in the course of conversation was heard to say that there was only one man living who could touch him as regards the plot. This person was Tesimond, who, as Garnett alleged on his examination, had given him leave to divulge the case upon which he had consulted him, if he were in danger of torture, but in no other case. With Garnett, his servant, Nicholas Owen was taken. This man was tortured till he was ruptured so severely that he died; when it was given out that he had made an end of his own life—pictures being hawked about London representing him in the act of ripping himself open with a knife as he lay in bed, whilst his keeper was in the room "busy about some other thing." No additional light is thrown upon the motives or the acts of the eight lay conspirators who were brought to trial on the 17th, and executed on the 30th and 31st, of January, 1606. Winter at his death exonerated Tesimond from any participation in the plot. This was the person who in confession had mentioned the plot to Tesimond, who had consulted Garnett about it, Tesimond having leave (so Gerard asserts) from Winter to do so. Soon afterwards (March 28) Garnett was arraigned and condemned for concealing the treason, there being no proof that he was further concerned in it than that he knew of it in confession, which he admitted; the circumstances of the trial are well known, and are certainly not creditable to an English court of justice. Such proceedings would never be tolerated in the present day; but Garnett in his defence of equivocation goes to lengths which probably few Jesuits would have wholly approved. He was executed on the 3rd of May, protesting that he utterly disapproved and earnestly dissuaded the plot, which he had only known of in confession.

Upon the whole, the impression left upon the mind by the perusal of the whole narrative is that Father Gerard is far too anxious to proclaim his disapproval of all such attempts as the Gunpowder Plot. It is not possible to resist the belief that, if it had been successful, there would have been a general rally of the Roman Catholic party anxious to make the most of the occasion, and to place upon the throne one of the King's children, whom they would have taken care to educate in the Roman faith. Nor would their conduct in so doing have been at all unnatural. They had been subjected, and still were subject, to persecutions of the bitterest kind. The vivid picture of the dangers undergone both by priests who performed the offices of their Church and laymen who harboured them for that purpose enlists our sympathies in their favour; and it seems to us matter for surprise that the plot was not more widely known and more heartily entered into. There can be little doubt that the Jesuits, probably as a matter of policy, discountenanced such proceedings in general; and certainly

no evidence was produced upon any of the trials which implicated them in any direct sanction of the proceedings of the conspirators. But one cannot help calling to mind, as one reads Father Gerard's often-repeated disclaimer, the French proverb "Qui s'excuse s'accuse." And it does not appear to us that Garnett exerted himself either as much as he might have done, still preserving the seal of confession, or as much as he implies he had done, in attempting to prevent the conspiracy.

There is a gap at the end of the fifteenth chapter of the Narrative which is much to be regretted, because in the remainder of the chapter the author promises some particulars of Garnett's earlier life, of which but little is known. In all probability Gerard waited for authentic intelligence on the subject, which either never reached him, or which came to hand too late for him to make proper use of it. The last two chapters are taken up with a description of "the state of Catholics" after Garnett's execution, and an enumeration of penal laws enacted by Elizabeth and James against them. These laws may be seen in the Statute-book. It may be worth while to call attention to a very obvious division of them into two classes—namely, those passed at the commencement of the reign of Elizabeth, and those made subsequently to the foolish and wicked Bull of Pius V. of 1570. The work is in several places incomplete, and there is a note at the end, after the writer has given an account of the confirmation of the statutes of the previous reign, which was enacted in the first year of the reign of James I., to the effect that he intended to add the chief laws made in the third year of the King's reign. These, indeed, have nothing to do with the plot, which was discovered some months before; but the idea was to show how much Catholics must needs suffer under so heavy a yoke more than they do under the Turk or any other Government, and how hard it is for Catholics to live in such trials, being so barred the Sacraments and helps according to that of St. Bernard, "Vae illis qui assumuntur in fortium et non aluntur fortium." And, in conclusion, we must admit that the author, when he does not pretend to justify the plot, but only to palliate the wickedness of those engaged in it, will carry with him to a certain extent the feelings of all who are advocates of religious liberty and toleration. The last passage of his work is in this point of view worthy of being transcribed, giving as it does the explanation of one principal motive which must have actuated him in its composition:—

But especially when he called the Second Parliament, and in that suffered to be packed together all the principal Puritans of the realm, whose insatiable hatred against Catholics we knew very well would never take up until they had made laws answerable to their mind and malice against us. Then they all before the Parliament consulted and concluded of the bills and laws they would urge to be passed against Catholics, as afterwards indeed it was performed. And many of those intended laws were known to divers Catholics long before the Parliament time, which, as it is thought, was a great motive unto the gentlemen to undertake their rash and dangerous conspiracy, as deeming so desperate a course to be a needful remedy in so desperate a case.

#### THE ROSE-GARDEN.\*

THE author of the *Rose-Garden* has attempted a difficult task. To make her heroine cowardly, untruthful, without anything like a working conscience, profoundly selfish, inconsequent, and uncertain, yet to render her at the same time lovely and lovable—to infuse into these evil characteristics a certain charm rather than any one great antiseptic quality, and to throw a stronger interest round her than round the upright and loyal Gabrielle, her "sacrifice"—was not easy; but it has been accomplished without affectation and successfully. We have seldom met in fiction with a more fascinating little witch than Renée Dalbarade. No one can respect her, and no one can help loving her. She is one of those women who seem sent into the world to upset the theories of philosophers and the whole moral law, and to show how well they can get on with only a pleasure-loving temperament, a fine pair of eyes, and no goodness to speak of. But we have a word or two to say on this very character of Renée, which, fascinating as it is, seems scarcely quite right, artistically considered. It is prettily conceived and prettily painted, but it seems to drift somehow, and the last part to be scarcely in harmony with the first. Either the subject-matter was too difficult to render with logical fidelity, or the author let the original idea slip out of its place, and after having begun from one model unconsciously finished off from another. The Renée of the earlier pages, if with many of the faults that become more prominent as the story advances, has certain qualities which seem to get lost or at least indistinct. Pleasure-loving and pain-dreading as she is, she yet has more courage and directness in the beginning than the author allows her towards the end. She could brave her mother, and that terrible uncle of hers, for the sake of letting the truth be known; and she could stand loyally by the man who loved her, and whom she did not love, and could act towards him nobly and without selfishness; but she suffers herself to be drawn into a shameful plot against truth, uprightness, and the man she does love, Jean de Savigny; though whether her weakness is due to her love for him, or her more ambitious desire to be the wife of a rich man—fear of losing him being predominant in either case—remains a little obscure. Apparently she loves him before marriage; afterwards she becomes cold and indifferent; and we do not think the explanation

\* *The Rose-Garden.* By the Author of "Unawares." London: Smith, Elder, & Co.

given by the author, that his devotion to her rendered her careless—unless even of common courtesies—exactly true to nature; more specially as, breaking in on the selfish nonchalance of her ordinary life, come passionate scenes like that in the rose-garden, where, as more than once before, she is half inclined to confess the fraud to which she has been a party; but does not. The following extract may serve as a summary of affairs between the husband and wife before the dreadful secret is published:—

Renée herself cared little for her husband's displeasure, so long as he did not know her secret. She could read her power over him and was shrewd enough to understand that there was a point at which that might fail, but that as long as he trusted and believed in her his deepest anger would be abated. She had but to put out a little fascination and he yielded with scarcely a struggle. Indeed, her real grief, still at times violent enough to alarm him, was sufficient alone to make him repent the very shadow of harshness, and to lavish a depth of tenderness upon her, to which Gabrielle could hardly believe she was indifferent. And yet it forced itself more and more upon her as the winter went by—the kindly southern winter to which there was scarcely a sharp edge—that he was vainly striving to win his wife's love, and that he would have had a better chance of doing so if he had cared less about her. He loved her so deeply that she had a hundred ways of wounding him in her power, and some malicious spirit induced her to delight in exercising them. She would affect to misunderstand his words; if he tried to draw her to his side to look at a letter or a plan, she would yawn, play with Coquin, or slip away like an idle child. He was very patient; it was sometimes touching to see how small a concession on her part would cheer him, but the lines in his face deepened, the harassed expression became more fixed.

At one time she forgets to order the carriage to meet him at the station; at another she leaves the house to pay a morning call without having seen him on his return from a journey; yet all the while we are to suppose she really loves him, as indeed is proved at the end. We are to remember that she is hiding a horrid secret, which she believes would ruin her for ever if made known, and that she is in her heart afraid of her husband, and more than a little overborne by her sense of his goodness and superiority. All this makes her conduct too much like that of a child playing with fire, too absurdly rash and inconsiderate, for the action of a shrewd, sharp, clever little woman as Renée is in other matters. But, as the author confessedly designed to draw a character full of subtle contradictions, we must accept the portrait as it is presented, and make the best of it.

The author of the *Rose-Garden* has two excellent qualities for her business. She can paint pictures, and she can draw character. She has fine artistic perceptions of form and colour, and she does not overload her descriptions. The picture of Bayonne, in the opening pages, is full of charm; and the slight sketch of the garden at *Maison Chalosse*, where Renée the arch witch, Madame Dalbarade her mother, and pretty, saintly, tender Gabrielle, her cousin, live under the tyranny of *la vieille grecque Jacqueline*, is both vivid and suggestive. One sees the places described, and a few incisive touches laid on with breadth and decision do more than all that elaborate stippling, that minute "word-painting," which fatigues far more than it informs. Of her power of character-drawing, the interest and life-likeness of the personages in the *Rose-Garden* is a sufficient proof. Perhaps the best is that of Grégoire de Méhun, the good, heavy, old young man, who has no more notion of making love than if he were carved out of wood like the figure-head of a ship, but whose love, given, not made, is as loyal and as pure as any Bayard or Sir Galahad could have felt. The scene where Renée, to protect Grégoire from his insolence, divulges her uncle's shameful secret, then refuses to marry her clumsy, good, devoted lover, because she had no longer a virgin heart to offer, is really pathetic in its heroism and self-renunciation. It is beyond the range of the ordinary novel, and all the more so as it is told simply and without straining after fine language. Perhaps a little less running commentary would have been better art; but we can scarcely object to what was evidently written out of the author's own heart, and not thrown in as mere make-up and to gain time. There is all the difference between sincerity and affectation in this close identification of the author with his characters. The art is bad in both cases, but in the former it is a venial error, in the latter an unpardonable fault.

Though only a sketch, the character of Madame de Méhun, Grégoire's mother, is also very beautiful and natural. The "kind old eyes" that filled so easily with tears, the simplicity of nature that could not keep even the secret of the chocolate creams as the surprise of the picnic, the tender heart that suffered and then forgave, and the unbounded love for her son, whose very *gaucheries* she looked on as graces, are all very prettily portrayed. But we are sorry to say that Madame de Méhun is, of all the characters in the book, the least characteristically French. Even the mode of negotiating the marriage of her son is not French; and we are surprised that an author evidently so much at home in the life of France could have depicted such a courtship as that of Grégoire de Méhun and Renée Dalbarade. Doubtless license must be taken by the writers of fiction if they would give novelty and interest to their tales; and just as all our pretty women are not murderesses or bigamists—which, if we were to believe certain writers, they are—so the rule in French life is not for the young man and woman to be allowed to fall in love first, through a freedom of intercourse quite as great as any extant here in England, and then, when the affections of one or the other are engaged, for the mothers to come to an understanding together. On the contrary, whether in Paris or Bayonne, the terms of the marriage are arranged first; the income of the son and the dowry of the daughter being the foundation of the whole affair; and even when engaged, only such well

watched intercourse is allowed as would be thought by an English girl restricted towards a ball-room partner. Here Grégoire pays his addresses in quite an English manner, and only when he is hopelessly in love, and Renée apparently quite content, does his mother open fire on Madame Dalbarade, who meanwhile has formed other views, and flung her daughter into the way of another and a better *parti*. This would be quite intelligible conduct in a Belgravian mother; in a French one it is simply impossible. But if the author of the *Rose-Garden* had shifted her scene, and located her *dramatis personae* at Falmouth or Dover, she would have lost all that rich Southern colouring and quaint translated French talk which now give her book its special character. Still it is a pity to get interest out of any violation of local truth; and this is a very great violation of local truth. It is part of the author's deficiency in weaving a plot on which we commented in our review of a former work of hers; for if she could handle her material with thorough mastery, she would find means to make her story true both to human nature and national life, wherever the scene might be laid.

Gabrielle is the saint and the sacrifice of the book. She is perhaps a more conventional figure than Renée—one of the timid, blushing, blue-eyed, tender virgins who want "salt," as the Arabs say. She is lonely and misunderstood at *Maison Chalosse*. Her aunt, who has nerves and is irritable, is impatient with her quietness, and disdains her because she is not amusing; Jacqueline frankly dislikes her, partly for the same reason, partly because she has money and Renée her beloved has none; Renée loves her in her own spoilt selfish way, but though she will not let any one else behave ill to her, she has no scruple about teasing her for her own part; only M. de Savigny is kind to her, without special intention, and Gabrielle falls in love with him in consequence. But it is the story of the ewe lamb over again. Renée, who has everything and values nothing—love and adoration from all—takes this as well as the rest; and poor Gabrielle has to wake from her dreams and relinquish her shadows; which also is not French. One more objection and we have done. If M. de Savigny was so good and true man as he is painted, how was it that he did not see through M. Jerome Lefevre? He was no fool, but he acted uncommonly like one. We should have thought that none but the veriest novice would have taken up with a stranger as he took up with M. Lefevre; and that, however much a man may be in love, he would have sufficient common sense to require more than the mere prayer of his betrothed before making even her uncle his bailiff or *intendant*. We hope that the author of the *Rose-Garden* is not always going to miss, by only so little, real excellence. She wants merely a little more to make her work absolutely good; for she has some rare and charming qualities which ought to place her among our favourite writers. We hope to see her do still better than she has hitherto done; for there is no reason why, with careful self-culture and diligence, she should not be one of the popular novelists of her time.

## NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

## THE SATURDAY REVIEW

or  
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

## CONTENTS OF No. 863, MAY 11, 1872:

England and America.  
The Ballet Bill.—Spain and the Carlists.—Army Contracts in France.  
The Correspondence with Canada.—Mr. Gordon's Victory.  
M. Thiers and the Council of State.—The Shunting of the Permissive Bill.  
Our Foreign Visitors.

The Peculiar People.—Trials.  
The Meannesses of Respectability.—Peops of Spirits.  
Metropolitan Schools.—A Positivist Oracle.—Justices' Clerks' Fees.  
The Royal Academy.—The Theatre.

The Founders of the Belgian Monarchy.  
Morris's Historical Outlines of English Accidence.—Russian Life.  
Essays on Cathedrals.—The Story of Sir Edward's Wife.—Littau's Medical Essays.  
Father Gerard.—The Rose Garden.

## CONTENTS OF No. 862, MAY 4, 1872:

The American Compromise.—Women's Suffrage.—The Carlist Insurrection.—The Ballot Bill.—The Orleanist Party.—The Debate on Lord Hatherley's Bill.—A New Reform Bill Threatened.—The Licensing Bill.—The Opposition and Mr. Fawcett's Bill.  
May Meetings.—Post-Cards.—Parliamentary Eloquence.—The Endowed Schools Commissioners.—Fools of Comedy and Farce.—Vesuvius.—C. B. "At Home"—The Battle of Wakolda.—Lord Clarence Paget and the Admiralty.—The Two Thonson.

Clark's Early Roman Law.—Levi's History of British Commerce.—The London Parks.—Freeman's Growth of the English Constitution.—Essays by the Author of "Vera"—A Colonist on Colonial Policy.—Carey's Commercial Book of Epigrams.—Perplexity.—French Literature.

[May 11, 1872.]

## ADVERTISEMENTS.

## THE LONDON EXHIBITION of 1872.

**THE LONDON EXHIBITION of 1872.**—The LONDON EXHIBITION of 1872 is OPEN DAILY, from 10 A.M. to 6 P.M. The S.E. Entrance in Exhibition Road is open from 8 A.M. to Season Ticket Holders only.

## LONDON INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of 1872.

There are FOUR ENTRANCES, open from 10 A.M. to 6 P.M.:

1. South-east Entrance in Exhibition Road.
2. North-east Entrance in Exhibition Road.
3. North-west Entrance in Prince Albert's Road.
4. North Entrance on east side of Royal Albert Hall.

**THE LONDON EXHIBITION of 1872—SEASON TICKETS** for the LONDON EXHIBITION of 1872 NOW on SALE at the Albert Hall Ticket Office, and at the usual Agents. Gentlemen, 2s.; Ladies, 1s.

**THE LONDON EXHIBITION of 1872.—THE OWNERS** of SEASON TICKETS are entitled to ADMISSION to the Exhibition on ALL OCCASIONS when open, including the reserved days.

To ADMISSION to CEREMONIES and PRIVATE VIEWS.

To ADMISSION to the GALLERIES of the EXHIBITION TWO HOURS BEFORE the PUBLIC.

To ADMISSION to the MUSICAL PROMENADES in the ROYAL HORTICULTURAL GARDENS and MUSICAL RECITALS in the ROYAL ALBERT HALL in connexion with the Exhibition.

**THE LONDON EXHIBITION of 1872.—ADMISSION:** On Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, and Saturdays, 1s.; on Wednesdays, 2s. 6d.; except on certain reserved days, which will be duly advertised.

## CRYSTAL PALACE.—SPECIAL ATTRACTIONS.—THIS DAY AND NEXT WEEK.

SATURDAY (May 11)—THE GREAT FLOWER SHOW OF THE SEASON, PROMENADE CONCERT, &c.

WEDNESDAY—THIRD NATIONAL CAT SHOW (First day).

THURSDAY—OPERA at 3. FIREWORKS at 9 P.M. CAT SHOW (Last day).

SATURDAY—GRAND SUMMER CONCERT at 3.

Admission, Flower Show, 7s. 6d.; other days, 1s., except Saturday, 5s. (or by Ticket purchased before the day, 2s. 6d.). Guinea Season Tickets free.

## MUSICAL UNION.—DUVERNOY, Pianist. Tuesday, May 14,

Quarter past Three. With Maurin, Wiener, Waefelghem, and Lassere. Quartet, No. 7, in F. Beethoven. Trio, C minor, Mendelssohn. Quartet in D, No. 75, Haydn. Grand-duo, Duvernoy. Tickets, 10s. 6d. each; and 1s. 6d. for Tickets to three or more Guests; to be had of Lamborn Cocks, and of Austin, St. James's Hall. Members can pay for Visitors. J. ELLA, Director, Victoria Square.

**THE SOCIETY OF PAINTERS in WATER-COLOURS.—**The SIXTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL EXHIBITION is now OPEN, at 5 Pall Mall East, from Nine till Seven. Admittance, 1s. Catalogue, 6d. ALFRED D. FRIPP, Secretary.

**ELIJAH WALTON'S COLLECTION of OIL and WATER-COLOUR PAINTINGS, now ON VIEW, at his GALLERY, 4 Westminster Chambers, Victoria Street, Westminster.**—Admittance, 1s., including Catalogue. Open Daily from Ten till Dusk.

**DORÉ GALLERY.—GUSTAVE DORÉ, 35 New Bond Street.** EXHIBITION of PICTURES (including "CHRISTIAN MARTYRS," "MONASTERY," "TRIUMPH OF CHRISTIANITY," "FRANCESCA DA RIMINI"). Six.—Admission, 1s.

**UNDERGROUND JERUSALEM.—AN EXHIBITION of WATER-COLOUR PAINTINGS by WILLIAM SIMPSON, illustrating the Recent Explorations, Fall Mat. Gallery, 48 Pall Mall (Mr. THOMPSON's).** Ten to Six. Admission, including Descriptive Catalogue, 1s.

**MISS GLYN (Mrs. E. S. DALLAS) will READ** several of her favourite Scenes from Shakespeare at the CONVERSAZIONE of the LONDON INSTITUTION, on Wednesday, May 12. The Library will be opened at 6.30; the Theatre at 7.30. Evening Dress.

London Institution, Finsbury Circus. THOMAS PIPER, Hon. Sec.

**ARTISTS' GENERAL BENEVOLENT INSTITUTION, for the Relief of Distressed Artists, their Widows and Orphans.** President—Sir FRANCIS GRAFT, P.R.A.

The Most Noble the MARQUIS of LORNE will Preside at a Dinner, to be held at Willis's Rooms, St. James's, on Saturday, the 19th of May, in aid of the Funds of this Institution. The Cost of the Dinner, including Wines, 2s. 6d. Tickets can be obtained from the Stewards or Officers of the Society, who also will receive notice of Donations, to be announced at the Dinner.

JOHN EVERETT MILLAIS, R.A., Hon. Secretary. FREDERICK W. MAYNARD, Assistant Secretary.

24 Old Bond Street, W.

**THE CHURCH DEFENCE INSTITUTION,** 2 PARLIAMENT STREET, S.W. President—The ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY.

The CHURCH DEFENCE INSTITUTION is a Union of Churchmen for Church Defence, without reference to religious or political party. Applications for forming Auxiliaries will be forwarded on application to the Secretary, to whom also Subscriptions and Donations can be paid. ALFRED T. LEE, LL.D., Secretary.

**INDIAN CIVIL ENGINEERING COLLEGE.**—It has been determined by the Secretary of State for India in Council that, in the EXAMINATION for ADMISSION into this College intended to be held in July 1872, and in all future Examinations, no Candidate will be allowed to compete who shall, on the 1st of the month, have attained the age of Twenty. For the Examinations in 1872 and 1873, the maximum limit of age will remain, as at present, at Twenty-one.

India Office, April 23, 1872.

**INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE.—The following are declared to be the SUCCESSFUL CANDIDATES at the recent Open competition for the Civil Service of India:**

In order of Merit.	Total No. of Marks.	In order of Merit.	Name.	Total No. of Marks.
1. Drummond, J. E. ....	2,041	19. Fawcett, G. W. ....	1,373	
2. Harrison, J. H. ....	1,961	20. Cartairs, H. ....	1,348	
3. Worlidge, T. E. ....	1,819	21. Silcock, H. F. ....	1,337	
4. Kite, E. ....	1,782	22. Cumine, A. ....	1,330	
5. Gurney, L. ....	1,718	23. P. J. ...	1,328	
6. Frazer, H. ....	1,567	24. Ladhan, B. S. de C. ....	1,315	
7. Thomson, R. G. ....	1,508	25. Tatte, W. J. ....	1,311	
8. Barnes, H. S. ....	1,487	26. Langdon, F. N. ....	1,308	
9. Gurney, W. G. ....	1,487	27. Chisholm, G. L. ....	1,305	
10. Case, A. E. ....	1,487	28. ... H. ....	1,300	
11. Anderson, J. A. ....	1,483	29. Blyth, W. D. ....	1,315	
12. Dene, R. M. ....	1,457	30. Hardinge, F. H. ....	1,302	
13. Bird, J. W. ....	1,430	31. Phillips, H. A. D. ....	1,189	
14. ... F. ....	1,426	32. ... H. ....	1,187	
15. Jeffreys, J. A. ....	1,426	33. Savage, H. ....	1,154	
16. Moore, P. W. ....	1,384	34. Norton, D. ....	1,130	
17. Courtney, R. ....	1,352	35. Kennedy, J. ....	1,119	
18. Guel, J. D. ....	1,379	36. Brett, C. M. W. ....	1,083	

Pupils of Mr. WREN, 3 Powis Square, Westbourne Grove, who Prepare Resident and Non-resident Pupils for Indian Civil Service.—Address, till May 31, Albion House, King's Road, Brighton.

## INDIA CIVIL SERVICE.—SELECTED CANDIDATES

Nos. 12, 19, 21, and 23 passed DIRECT from KINGSTON SCHOOL, which they entered at the age of Thirteen, Fifteen, Seventeen, and Fourteen years respectively. No. 12 passed in the first year of age qualification. Six out of Nine who passed Direct from the School in previous years received their Education exclusively at Kingstown School.—Rev. JOHN WESTROPP CHAMBERS, Head-Master, Kingstown School, Kingstown, near Dublin.

**HANOVER.—PRIVATE TUITION.**—The ENGLISH CHAPLAIN (a Cambridge M.A., with Mathematical Honours) undertakes the care and Education of FOUR PUPILS. One or two Vacancies this month.—Address, Rev. N. G. WILKINS, 5 Emmerthor Weg, Hanover.

**A CLERGYMAN,** late Fellow of his College, taking a few YOUNG BOYS to PREPARE for the PUBLIC SCHOOLS, has a Vacancy at present.—For terms, &c., address B. D., Homefield, Mitcham Common, Surrey.

**M. R. A. DAWSON CLARKE (B.A. Cambridge)** and Mr. A. M. LIPSCOMB (B.A. Oxford) receive RESIDENT and NON-RESIDENT PUPILS for the University Competitive Examinations, and for the Universities of Cambridge, the last three years Pupils have been prepared for the following Examinations:—Oxford (Final, Intermediate, and Matriculation); Cambridge (B.A. Exam. and Matriculation); Indian Telegraph and Engineering College, and Woods and Forests; Woolwich, Direct Commission, Diplomatic Services, British Museum, Antiquities, Archaeology, Preliminary Law and Medicine.—For Terms, &c., apply to Mr. A. D. CLARKE, Torrington Square, W.C., or to Mr. A. M. LIPSCOMB, 33 Bernard Street, Russell Square, W.C.

**A T ILKLEY.**—Mr. ALGERNON FOGGO, M.A., of Christ's College, Cambridge, late Head-Master of the Bradford High School, takes TWELVE PRIVATE PUPILS, Boarders.—Address, Moorlands, Ilkley, Yorkshire. Refer in London to GEORGE FOGGO, Esq., Oriental Club, Hanover Square.

**ITALIAN LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, and HISTORY.**—Signor N. PERINI, whose Pupils obtained all the highest marks in Italian at the last Six Indian Civil Service Examinations, has a few Hours Weekly Disengaged.—Address, SIGNOR F., 261 Hampstead Road, N.W.

**TO the NOBILITY and GENTRY.—A CLERGYMAN,** very successful as an Educator, desires to TRAVEL with a FEW YOUTHS on the Continent or elsewhere, from about September 15. The French Master of his School will be available to accompany the party.—For full particulars, apply to the Rev. D. C. L. STANFORD, 6 and 7 Charing Cross, London.

**ONE** who has mixed in distinguished Society, and Travelled extensively in the far East and West, would accept an Engagement as COMPANION and MENTOR to a Young Gentleman on Foreign Travel.—Apply to G. D., care of Mr. D. Nutt, Foreign Bookseller, 270 Strand, W.C.

**TEMPORARY WRITERS in GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.**—The Regulations for May may now be obtained on application to the SECRETARY, Civil Service Commission, Cannon Row, S.W. An Examination will be held on Thursday, May 16. Good handwriting is essential.

**NOTTINGHAM HIGH SCHOOL.—A MASTERSHIP** in the UPPER SCHOOL will be VACANT at Midsummer. Stipend £200 per annum, with allowance to take Boarders. Candidates are to apply, in the first instance, to the Head-Master, Mr. ROBERT DIXON, M.A., who will send them a printed Form to be filled up, with full particulars of the Appointment. The Trustees will not receive Applications later than May 11.

EDWIN PATCHITT, Clerk to the Trustees.

**BEAUMARIS GRAMMAR SCHOOL.—THE HEADMASTERSHIP** of this School will become VACANT on the 5th day of July next. CANDIDATES for the appointment must be Graduates of one of the English Universities, or of the University of Dublin. Satisfactory testimonials as to character and attainments will be required.

The present Head-Master receives a fixed salary of £170 a year, is allowed £18 a year towards the Annual Examination of and Prizes for the Scholars, £11 13s. for Coal and Gas. He occupies the School House and Premises free of Rent, Rates, Taxes, and Repairs; he takes upon himself the payment of his salary, appointment, and dismissal of all Assistant-Masters and Teachers, and makes his own terms with Boarders.

His successor will hold the office upon the same terms and conditions until any scheme of the Endowed School Commissioners for the administration of the School and Charity shall become law, or until his term of office expires.

Further particulars may be obtained from Mr. J. R. ROBERTS, Solicitor, Beaumaris, to whom Beaumaris, May 1, 1872.

**SECRETARY.—A GENTLEMAN** who has recently held a Public Appointment abroad, desires Employment as SECRETARY to a Noble or Gentleman engaged in Public Life. He is conversant with European languages, master of much useful original information, has Travelled extensively, and is accomplished in Literary pursuits.—Address, CHALACO, at Nutt's Foreign and Classical Library, 270 Strand, W.C.

**THE ILFRACOMBE HOTEL** stands in its own Grounds of Five Acres, extending to the Beach, and the Private Terraces afford the finest Marine Promenades attached to any Hotel in the Kingdom. The Building contains 210 Apartments. Cuisine excellent. Wines choice.—Address, J. BOHN, Ilfracombe.

**BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.**—Every endeavour is made to give to this Hotel all its long-existing repute. Spacious Coffee Room for Ladies and Gentlemen. See-Water Service in the Hotel.—Communications to The MANAGER, Bedford Hotel Company, Limited.

**THE BATHS.—THE GRANVILLE HOTEL,** St. Lawrence-on-Sea, Isle of Thanet.

**HYDROPATHY.—SUDBROOK PARK,** Richmond Hill. Physician.—Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D. Edin. Turkish Baths on the Premises. Public entrance into Richmond Park. Prospects on application.

**THE UNITED LAND COMPANY, Limited—DWELLINGS** for the WORKING and MIDDLE CLASSES.

The Company have now on SALE highly eligible BUILDING SITES in healthy Suburbs Localities, with all the advantages of thorough drainage, good roads and footpaths, and rapid communication with Town by rail, river, or omnibus, suitable especially for the Working and Middle Classes who, in addition to buying the Land at a cheap rate, with payment of the cost by easy instalments, can have advances for building on the plots on liberal terms, from the Conservative Benefit Building Society, co-operating with the United Land Company, Limited. The system has been at work twenty years, and has afforded all classes of the community the opportunity of becoming their own landlords, living on their own freehold. Facilities are also given to those who may wish to buy houses ready for occupation in various parts of the environs of the metropolis, the purchase-money being liquidated by monthly or other payments.

For Prospects and Particulars of Land and Houses for Sale, apply by letter or personally, at the Offices of the Land Company and Building Society.

CHARLES LEWIS GRUNEISEN, Secretary.

33 Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

**THE CONSERVATIVE LAND SOCIETY.—NOTICE** IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Ladyday Half-yearly INTEREST WARRANTS for SHARES and DEPOSITS were duly issued to all Members and Depositors entitled to the same at the usual hours, on the 1st instant, and that the amounts are payable at the Office daily between the hours of Ten and Four o'clock, except on Saturdays, and then from Ten to Two.

London, May 9, 1872. By Order of the Board.

CHARLES LEWIS GRUNEISEN, Secretary.

Prospects of the 20th year are now ready and will be sent free of charge and postage paid to any part of the world on application to the Secretary. The Interest on Shares remains at the rate of Five per Cent. per annum, payable half-yearly, and on Deposits at Four per Cent., with privilege of prompt withdrawal of either investment.

**PALL MALL CLUB (Non-Political).—MEMBERS** are hereby informed that the New and much enlarged CLUB-HOUSE in Waterloo Place, Pall Mall, will be open to all members on the 1st instant, May 14. A limited number of Candidates will be admitted at the following Fees: Entrance, Fifteen Guineas. Annual Subscription: Town, Five Guineas; Country Members (residing beyond Sixty miles from London), Three Guineas; Officers on Foreign Service, One Guinea.

Committee.

The Very Rev. Dean of Armagh. Adrian Hope, Esq. Major Brabazon. Edward Johnstone, Esq. Frederick Braby, Esq. Henry Kippen, Esq. W. Lloyd Birkbeck, Esq. Sydney Darby, Esq. The Hon. F. Godolphin Osborne, Esq. Rev. A. Dalgarven Robinson, Esq. Alexander N. Sheron, Esq. George Somes, Esq. The Hon. and Rev. W. H. Spence. Charles Hunter, Esq. Henry A. Acland, Esq. Maxwell Turnbull, Esq.

Henry Acland Hankey, Esq. Sir Charles L. Young, Bart.

Particulars as to Candidates may be had of THE SECRETARY.

**TO PROPRIETORS of PUBLICATIONS.—**Messrs. WYMAN & SONS are Prepared to Undertake the PRINTING of a WEEKLY PERIODICAL of Large Circulation—WYMAN & SONS, Newspaper and General Printers, Lincoln's Inn Fields, Printing Works, 74 and 75 Great Queen Street, London, W.C.